

# Anglican Theological Review

EDITED BY

FREDERICK C. GRANT AND BURTON S. EASTON

Founded by SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

---

VOLUME XXIX

JULY, 1947

NUMBER 3

---

## ATHENS *VERSUS* JERUSALEM

CONCERNING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ART AND RELIGION

By THOMAS BARRETT

Division of College Work, The National Council

We have been informed many times that two great traditions are at the base of western civilization: the Hebraic and the Hellenic. I see no reason to doubt this information as a rough, approximate truth. The Hebraic tradition expresses man's desire for other-worldly understanding—revealed by God; the Hellenic tradition, man's desire for this-worldly understanding—through the exercise of the human reason. The Hebraic spirit is a hunger and thirst after righteousness, a concern for the beauty of holiness, whereas the Hellenic spirit is a hunger and thirst for the holiness of beauty.

Since men are complex and defy precise measurement, it is true that no man is either completely Hebraic or Hellenic. The two strands merge. In a concrete person or historical event they are braided together. Like the two natures of Christ they can be distinguished for purposes of analysis and definition, even though they are not to be separated. For it would appear that both, the worldly and the other-worldly, struggle for the possession of the human soul, and that

in this life the most we can hope for (and should hope for, man being as he is) is a rough balance between the two.

Furthermore, there is within these traditions a range of subtle differentiation, which we may again attempt to distinguish by the two terms classic and romantic. The classic tradition here means the tradition greatly concerned with formal structure, simplicity, austerity, and in general, intellectualism. It is the rationalistic tradition, broadly speaking. The romantic is the less formal, less intellectual, more diffuse, rhapsodic, and sensual tradition—sometimes highly irrational. Again there are no pure classicists or romanticists; but Haydn and Bach can be considered classical composers, Wagner and Debussy romantics, and Beethoven or Brahms somewhere creditably between the two. Applying the terms to religious history King David is a romantic Hebraist, and Isaiah a classicist.

It is my opinion and the source of my interest, that while the balanced person and the balanced civilization are combinations of Hebraic and Hellenic, yet the

two traditions are in part quite opposed to each other. The religious sense of man and the artistic sense are no doubt at their source closely akin. It has been said that Religion, Art and Love are in a realm by themselves. Yet Religion (in any Hebraic sense) and Art—in their development—are not to be equated. Both claim autonomy and comprehensiveness and subject themselves to no outside authority. The Church appropriates the arts for its own peculiar uses, and the arts make use of religion. Wagner and Milton reveal their artistry through different religious traditions; and certainly Wagner, probably Milton also, were artists first and religionists afterwards. Art and Religion sometimes strike up a temporary truce and go along with some camaraderie, but like duellers they parry each other most of the time and never put up their swords. It seems to me only in a degenerate sense that we can speak of religion as an art (even though H. E. Fosdick has so spoken); and it is only in an incomplete sense that we can call art a religion. There are of course many people who have an "arty" religion, and many for whom art takes the place of religion; but the two are distinct human activities, and their occasional fusion is more apparent than real. The periods of virile, vigorous religion show an indifference if not an open hostility to art. The periods of virile, vigorous art show a certain indifference to religion. The greatest saints are rarely lovers of art, nor are the artists very faithful Hebraists. This is to be expected if, as I believe, art is centered in this world and the glorification of this-worldly things and pleasures, while religion, Hebraic religion, is centered in the next world which is to be

achieved by the willing surrender of this-worldly joys. The hybrid breed—an "arty" religion—neither glorifies the earth nor points the way to heaven.

The simple fact is that when men are concerned with the beauty of holiness, with God, grace, and eternal life, they are not so concerned with Greek vases. And it is fairly clear that the Dutch genre painters, the French impressionists, and the notable musicians of the romantic period were not much more pious than a group of undergraduates.

Another interesting point may be noted here briefly—a subject for further private deliberation. In any period of history the Hebraism or Hellenism, classic or romantic, which informs that period is reflected in all the arts at once—and in theology as well. In the present confused, groping world, some relationship is evident between the psychological poets, the surrealist painters, and the followers of Kierkegaard. In the last century, for example, the Oxford movement, in its return to the romance of the Gothic ages, paralleled the trend of painters, poets, and musicians in their revolt from the cold rationalism of the eighteenth century, toward a less formal, less rational, more sensual art. The difference here would seem to be that while the Tractarians returned to an old romance, the artists struck out into a new area—at least the best ones did. I assume part of the reason for this is that the Church as a conservative institution to which the faith has been delivered, the truth revealed, always turns to the past, if possible; whereas art, in its essence a somewhat rebellious enterprise, tends toward the unconventional, unexplored possibilities. The impressionists with their new theory and technique, the musicians led by Debussy,

Ravel and others with their strange new rhetoric, the poets of the untraditional diction, these romanticists of the Hellenic tradition were cousins to the Hebraic-Hellenistic romanticists with their escape into the somewhat irrelevant atmosphere of the Gothic chasuble and the antique plainsong—accompanied to some extent with a return to a naive theology, even in the age of Darwin.

Every age, however, is a complex and to some extent obscure flow of movements, schools, trends, and tendencies. As the romantic period in art degenerated into Swinburne, Ethelbert Nevin, Burne Jones and Anton Mauve, so in religion did another group of protestants, stemming from the romanticism of Schleiermacher, Ritschl, and Heiler, slither down into a vague, nebulous, and fictional socialism—through George Bernard Shaw to John Haynes Holmes, in six easy lessons. In a manner of speaking, when the romantic period came along, some of the Hebraists dove into the thirteenth century to come out in the twentieth, gasping in Gothic amazement to find themselves surrounded by plastics; and other Hebraists, trying to be eclectic and to follow the latest scientific fashion of the week, evolved into the twentieth century looking like the pale and delicate Sir Galahads of a decadent art—clad only in the doubtful armor of sweetness and light.

Perhaps this indirectly serves to show that Hebraists are generally bad Hellenists. Those who thirst after the beauty of holiness are not, being men, without their desire for the holiness of beauty. Yet wrapped as they are within the close, conservative fetters of institutionalism they rarely manage to keep abreast of the holy beauty of their time. They

make terms with art after it has become academic, after vitality has been squeezed out of it, in much the same fashion as Church publicity offices pounce upon a slogan for their annual ecclesiastical "program" which has been worn thin by the secular world for three years previously. Thus at the present time in Roman Catholic, Anglican and Protestant institutions, by some strange work of the devil, the artistic tradition is probably the worst in the last 500 years. I mean that which we call Victorian. For that particular time was one in which robust, sincere, vigorous Hellenism was being buried under an avalanche of a kind of Hebraism which might be called almost sinister: a moralism gone to seed in the unfertile ground of respectability. God was gone with the wind of the new science and only goodness was left to believe in. And goodness without God easily slithers down into conventional, non-scandalous behavior. This intellectual climate produced a sinister art. Not only lust but life itself was smothered under a veneer of innocuous, suave prettiness. The church vestibules, Sunday school pamphlets, Christmas cards are still surfeited with the undernourished Biblical characters that sometime back flowed sweetly from the nerveless, formless, colorless, emasculated brush of Hoffman. The arches of churches still rattle under the reverberations of the gaudy, pretentious, shrieky, "hop, skip and jump" tunes of Dudley Buck, Simpson, Parker, and all their florid colleagues, not to mention the members of the musical underworld who composed stuff for the Baptists. The words of many of our hymns stem from the same vine, and any reasonable man surrounded as he is today by skyscrapers, subways, electric refrigerators, atoms,

and the C.I.O., would cry out in humiliation at the insincerity of himself and the poet if he ever stopped to read the lines out loud without the music. And in an age when architecture has broken out with unprecedented originality, released in part by industrial progress, churches are still built that look like the gingerbread house of childhood—re-designed by the original architect of the Mississippi River steamboat. As a discriminating individual remarked, "Frozen-Sousa." Perhaps it is because we have been nourished so long on a decadent art, and because we are of the conservative Hebraic tradition, that we all find it difficult to understand, much more to appreciate, the mind of the Hellenist. Again the two minds are working in opposite directions. Each has a hard time getting on with the other. A sort of mental incompatibility exists between them, aggravated by the inevitable institutionalism of Hebraism and the inevitable individualism of Hellenism.

This brings me, by a kind of hidden, personal, if not open and public logic, to another consideration—the mind of the artist. I speak with temerity. But being a rudimentary dauber I feel I may have some worm-like conception of that perplexing subject, the artistic mind.

The artist in his concern for this world is not much concerned with the next—nor with the conditions required for entrance. He is an artist because he is this-worldly. If he is a good artist he is amazingly egotistical and self-confident, even when he sings, speaks, or paints his utter despair. It is his own imagination and perception that interest him, not God's, still less that of other men. When a colleague produces a work of art he says, "Marvelous performance," but only half means it. He feels

all the time he could do better himself. When the artist is interested in Hebraism, he is probably first of all interested in the drama of it—the heroic, epic, tragic element—before he is interested in the moral of it, or even the truth of it. Llewellyn Powys, one of the most sensitive, imaginative and tender writers of our time, has spoken of the Christ-child myth and how even to have the story is enough without asking that it be true. (Enough for a Hellenist but not enough for a Hebraist.) Someone has said the artist's reaction to the story of Eden to Calvary is one of intense aesthetic pleasure, satisfaction before a complete, inevitable, and logical drama.

The artist is essentially unorthodox. He is heretical, rebellious, skeptical, revolutionary. He does not care about established laws, or a "faith once-delivered," whether the laws are moral, ecclesiastical, doctrinal, economic or social. He makes his own laws; for his business is the creation of a world of his own out of such insight, imagination, skill and experience as he has. If he is not simply indifferent to imposed law, it is a part of his stock in trade to pretend he is, for even a hack painter knows that art cannot truly flower if it acknowledges limits to the range and expression of the imagination. There are no laws in painting or in the other arts except self-imposed laws. Creation means freedom. And there is no artist of any dimensions who is not, according to the standards of his time, "heretic, rebel, a thing to flout," an outlaw. This is not to say every lawless expression is great art, or even art. It is to say that the honest artist makes his own laws, which may or may not coincide with the established rules of his colleagues,



his censors, and the conventional social, utilitarian, and ethical standards of his time. Art has within it its own law and order, its own rigorous integrity, its own honest structure. Beethoven has his laws of composition, melodic line, harmony, and structure, sufficient to bear what he wanted to express. If that "Beethoven law" is taken as something universal by some other artist, then decadence sets in. Cézanne is a law-abiding artist; he has his color, his balance of masses, his own form, his own authentic, unmistakable structure. If I should accept that law of Cézanne as a necessary law, I would be even less likely to produce a piece of good painting than I am at present. The artist is a Hellenist. He is searching for the holiness of beauty. Even as he reveals to the Philistine, banker, priest, housewife, or college girl some new, fresh, gleaming aspect of the wondrous world, so that it becomes for all of them a significant disclosure of beauty, he is rebellious against his own invention, and starts out to penetrate some other thicket, turning his back on that which has become known and understood. So the once interesting figures of Gladys Rockmore Davis are, now through the courtesy of Munsingwear, as common as the Lucky Strike slogan, and Gladys, if she is a true Hellenist, will be out seeking fresh fields to conquer.

The artist today or in any day is attempting to interpret to the unrecognized senses of ordinary men his own peculiar image and understanding of a particular person, place, things, or event, in order that the limits of their thought and imagination concerning the world in which they live may be expanded. He has no concern with universals—which distinguishes him from the sci-

entist—except as they may emerge undeniably and mysteriously and unexpectedly out of his skillful and intense penetration of the dense, vivid, qualitative and personal particular that confronts him. Daumier for instance, in his "Third Class Railway Carriage," is not trying to paint universal man. He is painting these particular people at a particular time, in a particular place. Only because he has seen deeply and richly into these people does something emerge of the universally brave, dramatic, patient pilgrimage of mankind.

Hebraists find it difficult to understand all these strange things, and these artistic people. They are not "knowing" in what an artist is trying to do, or supposed to do. Especially in a scientific, photographic age does their artistic ignorance increase. The Babbitts look at a modern painting and say, "I never saw anything like that, I don't get anything out of it, it doesn't look like much." The answer the artist ought to make is a simple one: "Of course you never saw anything like that. You probably never felt like that either. If you had, you would be an artist instead of puttering around with bank balances and golf balls." The Hebraist—here emasculated to include the conventional, respectable and upright citizens who believe in Rotary, the profit motive, and inevitable progress—wants to see what is familiar—to hear the same sounds he has heard before. Worse still, he wants his art to serve some utilitarian purpose—to make morals better, or business better, to educate people about "how to win friends and influence people." Thus we turn off the Shostakovich symphony because it doesn't sound like Victor Herbert, or even Beethoven, and we prefer the cows-in-pasture pictures of Tryon, or the un-

inventive conventionalism of Norman Rockwell's "Four Freedoms," to the mental strain of seeing and interpreting the fresh, contemporary, relevant painting of a Benton, Marin, Riviera, Marsh, or other more esoteric painters, such as Klee and Kadinsky.

I have a friend who is always after me to paint a picture of a priest in red robes at Mass—surrounded by candle light. There are several hundred reasons why I wouldn't attempt it. In order to please my friend I would have to do it "realistically," as he would call it, which means it should look like a colored snapshot. Furthermore a priest at the altar is a subject in which I am not particularly concerned—as a would-be artist. Aside from being a rather stuffy, cloistered subject in an age of world-shaking events, a priest—stiff as an army colonel in red robes, arms upraised before the lighted candles done in the "slick-finish" tradition—has as much drama about it as a picture of a cockroach on a cushion. That may seem shocking and irreverent. I do not mean it to be. It is the idea of painting it, in a posed, academic, pseudo-religious manner, that is irreverent, because it is essentially dishonest. My friend doesn't realize that; he just has nostalgia, and doesn't like to think. There may be a way to paint the dramatic, aspiring, beauty-of-holiness action of the Eucharist—I know it hasn't been done—but I can't do it. It would involve what the layman would call distortion—perhaps violent color, a deal of uncommon imagination. The existing pictures of priests at altars are really advertisements for albes, candles, or the Catholic Church. They are essentially irreverent; in a way, much less religious than Hogarth's "Shrimp Girl," about as irreligious as John S. Sargent's paint-

ings of the prophets—a series that reminds one of a line of chorus boys in blankets.

In our understanding of the Hellenist—romantic or classic—it has to be remembered that the artist has been blessed (or cursed) with a sensualness and a sensitivity not given to the average Hebraist. We rely mainly on a tradition. With us the pursuit of holiness comes first. The artist relies on the nakedness of his own soul—the loneliness of his own imagination. He paints, he cannot help himself. He paints perhaps in part for money, for prestige, for himself, in order to inform, to educate, to enlighten morally, socially, politically. But there always seems to be some motive beyond these other motives. He paints, or writes, or composes, in a frenzy of forgetful activity from which he cannot stop until for better or for worse he has incarnated the fertile word that had to become incarnate. Beyond all the moral, economic, humane motives, or the immoral and inhuman motives, that may have had a part in his activity, he paints because there was for him some singular experience when he was "voyaging through strange seas of thought alone"; he has had some secret glimpse of "magic casements opening on the perilous seas in faery land forlorn."

As a dauber, after a fashion, let me offer some small advice. When you look at a picture, before you say to yourself, "That doesn't look like anything I've ever seen," ask yourself this question: "What am I looking for?" Information?—that's for scholarly books. Factual truth?—that's for scientists. Moral uplift?—that's for preachers. A lifelike reproduction of some bucolic scene?—that's for stenographers with candid cameras on a two weeks' vacation.

What you ought to look for are signs of a free, sensitive, penetrating imagination which, with skill, originality, and integrity, is expressing itself with some reason, as well as rhythm, about the mysterious, dense fabric of this particular world.

Here I would like to say a word about abstract art. It is good to make pleasant designs with lines and color and forms. But let us not try to see more than can be seen in abstract painting. When someone tells you that a construction in planes and angles is pure aesthetics, just say "Nuts." It may be very interesting—emotive in color, good in composition, decorative as wall paper. But abstract art has all the limits of any abstraction. It is only a part of reality. By its nature it abstracts general forms from whole, particular objects. An abstractionist pulls in his vision, so to speak, so that things that look like things are omitted and only vague shapes, forms, remain—that look like things in spite of themselves. I doubt if any thinking artist is ever satisfied with abstraction as a life pursuit. It imposes too great limitations on his freedom. And besides, the depths of an artist's insight, the scope of his imagination, the fertility of his perception—the artist himself—can never be truly seen or measured until he has responded to the painful, joyful, comic, and tragic aspiring and despairing pattern of the whole human scene. No artist will ever be judged as truly noble until he has shown his genius to create a peopled world, and to interpret with passion, originality, and power what he knows of truth about man and the universe in which he lives.

Georgia O'Keefe paints delicate, orderly, strangely mysterious, erotic and

abstract pictures of skulls and flowers and barns and worms and things. It is a relatively closeted imagination she reveals, though with consummate technique. It has plenty of rhythm but not so much reason. It takes a broader scope to be among the great. It takes the interpretation of the concrete world—which is a world not without mystery, fantasy, ugliness, and the strange currents of subliminal thought. An artist who stuck for a lifetime to abstractions, still life, and landscape, would doom himself to relative unimportance beside those who create worlds of men and women under pain and hope and tribulation and triumph. Constable and Monet are lesser figures in the pantheon of art than Michael Angelo, or van Gogh. And it is not the technique that makes them so—it is the scope and depth of their imagination and their knowledge of man.

Finally, it seems to me that the noblest, most lasting art comes out, though generally by a path of its own, where religion comes out—on Calvary. It is when the artist deals with tragedy in such a manner as to bring about a transfiguration, that he comes closest to fulfilling his function as an artist. The very supreme masters are those who dealt with the tragic theme. Homer, Dante, Milton, Shakespeare, Beethoven, Giotto, Strauss, Rembrandt, El Greco, and others. Prettiness is not enough, nor the bizarre touch, nor brutality, nor ugliness, nor "sheer naturalism." It is when the idea of man's undaunted spirit becomes embodied through the given medium, incarnate through sweat and passion against ugliness and sin and evil, that creator and beholder both stand looking at each other "with a wild surmise, silent upon a peak in Darien."

For this means the creator once again has by his lonely, arduous, and intense love of his craft given evidence that man is made in the image of God, with freedom to create as God creates, and with power to overcome "the world, the flesh and the devil." In such a work of art as *Macbeth*, as Professor Taylor has pointed out, though the characters are evil, wicked beyond belief, yet by the genius of the artist does the play dignify, not degrade, the nature of man. The creator is triumphant over the intractable creations of his hand and brain. His artistry gives the lie to the unholy men and women of his world. When the play is over, one feels that life has windows opening on heaven as well as on hell; that man is created in God's image—not because of *Macbeth* and his evil wife, but because of Shakespeare.

The artist then has a way unto himself; he will generally appear to be a queer fellow; often his life will not seem to conform to the conventional standards of society. Yet for all his oddity and non-conformity he has his own integrity, his own laws, his own kind of humility before the astonishing, overwhelming riches of the created and uncreated world. Like Robert Frost, upon a stormy cloud-torn night, he will now and again be saying of his most transcendent moments,

"Where, where in heaven am I? But don't tell me!"

I warned the clouds, "By opening on me wide,  
Let's let my heavenly lostness overwhelm me."<sup>1</sup>

For unlike us, his more pedestrian, less imaginative fellows, he knows there are

no limits to the inexhaustible wonder of the world; and no precise answers to the most fundamental questions; and no possibility of expressing adequately the most exquisite moments of "this-worldly" experience. Only by fact and fancy, rhythm, artifice, symbol, metaphor, and color can he suggest the intensity of thought and feeling that is beyond good and evil, and within the comprehensive holiness of beauty.

Thus art and religion are uncomfortable bedfellows. For they aim in this world at different things. We Hebraists have to beware, lest in our human desire for the holiness of beauty we lose that incentive to pursue the beauty of holiness. Religion too easily appropriates the insincere, the dishonest, the archaic, the irrelevant, the sinister and irreligious "Tiffany window" kind of art, so that we have neither true Hellenism nor true Hebraism but a bastard thing, an "arty" religion, without vitality, purity, grace, or passion, without hunger or thirst for righteousness.

Yet being creatures of this world we cannot help but clothe our earthly worship in the garments of beauty. We must be in part Hebraic-Hellenic, in part classic, in part romantic, or we would not be men. God also had a thought for the glory of this world, and embodied the Word, that the world might not remain unadorned with Beauty, Truth, and Goodness.

One warning I think is always before us. Beware lest we offer to God the thing filled neither with holiness nor beauty. There is some difficult possibility of attaining that proper balance of Hebraism and Hellenism, of holiness and earthly glory. But if it is to be attained it must be by a very discrimi-

<sup>1</sup> From "A Further Range" included in *Collected Poems of Robert Frost*, 1939, by permission of Henry Holt and Co., Inc. (Copyright, 1930, 1936, 1939.)

nating, sensitive, honest, and precise use of the noblest art there is: art that will in part lift the earthly mind to God, and reveal to us a new dimension of human dignity, and not turn it toward thoughts of home and mother, adolescent love, and campus life at the University of New Jersey. And we shall do well to remember in these days, as the trend for Hebraists is toward romantic Hellenism, that there is a limit beyond which we cannot go—not without losing the simple, austere, factual character of true Hebraism. For it was no less a person than the King of Heaven who warned us against the Prince of this world and all his captivating works. Art is a business of securing our affection for this world; it is, as it were, a result of the fall of man, a make-believe—an Adam's attempt to return to Eden, before good and evil, and with a complete sensuousness to enjoy the rich and wondrous earth. It is a gallant, sometimes exalted attempt. But the Hebraist ought to remember that there is no return to Eden; there is only *on* to Paradise through the grace of another Adam.

The good and the evil of this world—yes and the beauty too—must be given up, in exchange for that entering into the joy of the Lord. It is given to the artist to recognize this also after his own un-Hebraic fashion; for who is the artist but a man given at once the awful vision of his transiency on earth, the compelling awareness of its goodness, and a torment of spirit out of which that goodness is expressed.

Let the words of an artist speak:

That time of year thou mayst in me behold  
When yellow leaves, or none, or few, do hang  
Upon those boughs which shake against the cold,  
Bare ruin'd choirs, where late the sweet birds  
sang.

In me thou see'st the twilight of such day  
As after sunset fadeth in the west;  
Which by and by black night doth take away,  
Death's second self, that seals up all in rest.  
In me thou see'st the glowing of such fire,  
That on the ashes of his youth doth lie,  
As the death-bed whereon it must expire,  
Consumed with that which it was nourish'd by.

This thou perceiv'st, which makes thy love  
more strong,  
To love that well which thou must leave ere  
long.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Shakespeare, *Sonnets*, 73.



## ANGLICAN CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION

By JOHN CULPEPER PLOTT

Chickasha, Oklahoma

The following is an effort to determine the theological norms by virtue of which a member of the Anglican Communion (Protestant Episcopal in the U. S. A.) has a right to conscientious objection, and the duties and responsibilities incurred by such a person.

### I. SCRIPTURE

Holding the Bible to be divinely inspired, but likewise believing in the sacred responsibility of the use of reason in its interpretation, the Anglican c.o. will probably not resort to quotation by chapter-and-verse; but he will be pointed in the following considerations.

(a) The Christian Gospel is above all things the "Good News of Peace." The vision of the shepherds ("Glory to God. . . . Peace to men of good will"), the Benedictus ("Blessed be the Lord God . . . and to guide our feet into the way of peace"), the Nunc Dimittis ("Lord now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace"), all have the Christian liberation of peace at their center. Jesus' favorite greeting both before and after the Resurrection is "Peace be with you." St. Paul's writings are never without such phrases as "the God of peace," "the Gospel of peace," "in whose salvation is our peace"; and he lists peace as one of the fruits of the Spirit. The "entering into rest" of the Epistle to the Hebrews is another aspect of peace as integral with faith and freedom. And so on through the whole New Testament.

(b) Regardless of how literally the Sermon on the Mount is to be taken, the

spirit in which it was given is absolutely binding on all Christians. The love of one's enemies is utterly incompatible with modern warfare, which cannot be waged without the creation of mass hatred by every known societal control and technique; and the positive responsibility of peacemaking is hardly reconcilable with the scientific perfecting of armaments. It may be true that the Mosaic Law against murder was to be applied only within the religio-tribal boundaries of Israel, but even without the injunctions to turn the other cheek, to do good to those who hate you, and to resist not evil but overcome evil with good, the parable of the Good Samaritan alone should make it completely clear that the Christian Intention can in no wise be so limited. The Gospel is for all nations, kindreds, and tongues; and will, when publicly and privately accepted *and lived*, deliver them from wars and all the plagues of Satan, and fashion them into one united kindred to dwell in peace on the face of the earth.

(c) There is nowhere in the New Testament any sanction of war; and while there is also no open specific condemnation of it, it is everywhere considered as a real evil, and a sign of Judgment. The redeemed are pictured in the Apocalypse as having washed their robes and made them white in the Blood of the Lamb, not in the blood of earthly enemies. Wars, enemies, evils of all sorts there may always be; but woe to him by whom they come! God may bring good out of evil; but the Christian is enjoined to cleave to that which is good.

God judges both those *by* whom, themselves also sinners, the judgment comes, and those as well *on* whom the judgment is given; man cannot usurp this final role. But Christian man can—and must—repent, withdraw, and turn the hearts of the enemy, by the boundless love of Christ, to similar repentance and hope in God's mercy in the face of Judgment.

(d) St. Paul's "whole armor of God," upon which the notion of the *miles Christianus* is founded, has no reference whatever to a temporal sword. This, and all other metaphors of fighting, cannot be made to imply that the heavenly battle and victory presuppose mandatory participation in carnal conflicts. The only defense of the faith is the Sword of the Word of Truth; and the Christian soldier, like St. Martin of Tours, renounces all else as not worth defending. The soldier of Christ is called to martyrdom, not to the spilling of other men's blood.

(e) Jesus' dictum "Render to Caesar . . . and to God the things that are God's" is more abused than obeyed—especially the latter half, where the emphasis clearly lies. It will be remembered (1) that it was given in reply to those who tempted him to armed revolt against the Roman rule; (2) that he was condemned to the cross, at ecclesiastical instigation, by that same government—by that same Caesar. Likewise, although St. Paul appealed to Rome for justice as a Roman citizen, and enjoins obedience to the Temporal Arm, he was also imprisoned and put to a martyr's death by reason of his non-compliance in matters of piety and conscience. Moreover, to the best of our knowledge, St. Peter met the same fate—or rather, gloried in it, being crucified upside down at his own request!

(f) St. Paul's doctrine of the Perfect Law of Liberty, although it gives no room for anarchy and license, lifts the redeemed man above all human legislation, statutory or ecclesiastical and binds him to the Law of God "engraven on our hearts." Hence, where the formal enactment goes beyond the love of Christ, the Christian is bound to obey God rather than men, and not to stain the liberty of his redemption. He cannot "pass the buck" under the guise of "obedience," since each man is responsible directly to his Maker and Redeemer for his own sins, and must "work out his own salvation with fear and trembling."

(g) Along with these things, it should be explicitly clear in every case that since the New Covenant in Christ's blood makes the Old Covenant "of none effect," the commands of God to the Israelites in matters of warmaking are not binding on the Christian. On the contrary, the vision of the prophets, of a time "when war shall be no more," and when "the lion shall lie down with the lamb," and when the nations shall "beat their swords into plowshares"—whether this comes straightway or only after a calamity of Antichrist—this vision should give the Christian hope that under the reign of Christ all things will "be made new," and perfect peace will come.

## II. DOGMATIC

The two dogmas, howsoever interpreted, to which the Anglican must subscribe—or rather, believe to his heart's peace—are the Trinity and the Incarnation. The correlative dogmas concerning the Atonement and the Church and her Sacraments naturally follow, as does the

Church's discipline and polity in regard to the State.

(a) In these dogmas he should find on the one hand a metaphysics of peace such that his life may have a divine confidence deeper than can be found in the powers of nature or the "wisdom of men," and on the other hand, safeguard against both extreme Asiatic fantasy and nihilism, and naive ethical progressivism.

God is at once both above and beyond the cosmos of which he is the Author and Creator, and immanent within it; and invenient, by judgment, mercy and miracle. It follows then that we may have valid hope and fear and love that will enable us to provide for and work toward the perfection of the cosmos in time and space; yet at the same time we regard this process of perfecting as relative. In the dogma of the Trinity we find both absolute and relative faith in the triumph of the good both here and hereafter. In serving God by working for His peace on earth, the Anglican pacifist is rewarded by the promise of participation in the Godhead and peace eternal.

But this does not happen either automatically or abstractly. The Incarnation of the Eternal Logos points up this process of peace historically; and, through the Atonement, sanctifies suffering as the means of triumph over death and the "powers of darkness." Man has passed through definite stages in the course of his evolution. The most important of these stages is that initiated in the life of Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Man, the Liberator, who in flesh and blood accomplished what the myths of Isis and Prometheus had forecast in imagination, and the prophets of Israel had described in eschatological vision.

Yet Incarnation is more than Illumination; Christ is not just another Avatar, but is *Only-begotten*, and atoning Savior. Nietzsche says "Blessed are the down-goers." It takes the Suffering God to redeem all mankind. The Christian symbol, next to the cross itself, is the rose, with living green leaves, pain-bearing thorns, and blossoming rich-hued in the desert. The lotus has its peace, lulling and reflective; but the lotus tells of no redemption. Jesus the Christ is the Prince of Peace because he is crowned, in mockery, with a crown of thorns on the throne of Calvary.

(b) In the Nicene Creed there is a clause, "Whose Kingdom shall have no end." Spiritually, this Kingdom is the Church. It follows that the Church cannot validly sanction anything that is not or may not become eternal. It is its divine commission to redeem the world (not to reform it, as some tend to think now), so that the "body of this corruption" may "take on incorruption" through participation in the Resurrection of the Son of Man. Christian hymnody has made much of this eternal continuity of the Church. Nations and empires, with their wars and conquests, rise and fall; whereas, though her members—or supposed members—do fall short of her Lord's perfection, and her outward structure and trappings need seasonal reformation and cleansing, the spiritual Body of Christ remains essentially imperishable and unblemished. Her only law is the perfect law of Liberty, and her only power is that from on high, God the Holy Spirit, working in the hearts of men. "My Kingdom is not of this world," said Jesus. "The Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive. . . . Peace I give you, my peace I leave with you . . . not as the world

gives." Then, "Tarry in Jerusalem, until you are endowed with power from on high."

(c) It is now indisputable fact that the pre-Constantinian Church did require renouncement of arms-bearing of all who were baptized. No theologian of major importance before St. Augustine found room for any casuistry in regard to war. The doctrine of a Just War (though be it noted that the conditions laid down therein cannot at all be fulfilled by modern warfare) is purely a Scholastic invention, as is also the doctrine of the "lesser of two evils." Although Anglican tradition does not reject Scholasticism where it is enlightening, it is not bound by it; and the early Church Fathers are taken as of higher authority than the Schoolmen of the 11th to 14th centuries. The Christian Faith is never to be confused with philosophical traditions, or compromised to fit political exigencies. Interpretation must never override Revelation. The Anglican pacifist, thus grounded, is not a heretic; he is rather zealous to see the Church return to her primitive purity in morals as well as in faith.

(d) Basic to all Anglican tradition (since tradition, though not of final authority, does have its place) is the polity of the *Via Media*. Rightly understood, this can only be a way—the Way—of peace. Derived as it is from the Platonic (as distinct from the Aristotelian) Golden Mean, generically (though not genetically) akin to the Confucian Doctrine of the Mean, and grounded in the consideration that the Will of God is primarily above all merely human comprehension, yet is apprehensible through the balanced mediation of the Word, the Church, and the individual syneresis, the *Via Media* affords

a unity-and-harmony in diversity-and-freedom which has proved to be of untold value in the reconciliation of religious differences (in the Ecumenical Movement as well as the Elizabethan Settlement) and in the development of a Christian culture. There is no room for antinomianism in Anglican polity. The Christian Society must be integral—wholly redeemed, completely peaceful.

The development of British Common Law, whose way is that of the Norm rather than the Standard, speculatively may be pointed to as a result of the prominent part the Church has had in the formation of the culture of the English-speaking world. The typical Anglican will tolerate anything, so long as it is not disorderly; for Order—as we are reminded by Bacon—is harmony, and harmony is peace, whether cosmological or political. The development of a Christian State, mirroring the *Civitas Dei*, becomes a real task for any Anglican Church; and in her efforts in this direction the Church of England has produced and nurtured many martyrs, statesmen and scholars, such as Thomas à Becket, Thomas More, Cranmer, Latimer, Lanfranc, St. Anselm, Erasmus, Dean Colet, Wm. Law, Lancelot Andrewes, Thomas Ken, and Wm. Temple. However, it must be acknowledged that, though her hands are not so blood-stained as the Church of Spain, the Church of England does not have a lily-white record. The apathy, intolerance, and injustice to which the early Quakers and the Puritans and the Methodists bear witness still burden her, calling for sincerity of repentance and a purer life. One way this new life must be made manifest is in zeal for social righteousness, and the development of a harmoni-

ous and peaceful World State, such as Erasmus envisioned.

(e) The problem for the Anglican c.o., then, is not so much pacifism as it is conscientious objection as a way to peace. The typical Anglican is an incurable realist; he will not forsake his *Via Media* for things that "just ain't there" or for manners which "are not proper." Fanaticism and intolerance are as bad, if not worse, than indifference.

Nevertheless, the absolute will of Christ must be realized in and through imperfect human society. Tolerance and propriety must not be allowed as excuse for vagueness and a lax conscience. The prophetic voice must be obeyed regardless of consequences. Let no one shame the cross.

In the Catechism there is a clause, "To do my duty in that state of life unto which it shall please God to call me." Following on this, the Anglican c.o. will not interfere with the ways of other men, except and unless they are clearly walking away from the way of eternal life; and he may solidly reply when questioned as to his stand that it is his vocation to take the witness of non-arms-bearing, just as it is the vocation of some to follow completely the counsels of perfection and enter the monastic life. As a matter of fact, he should seriously consider whether it is not his vocation to enter that life also. (Conversely, no Religious should ever take up arms, or even suggest sanction of such action.) But he will not stop there; for it is his vocation also to bring the whole Church into the same mind. His stand must not be selfish, or leave his fellow-churchmen unaffected or unobligated. Rather, in the name of our Saviour, he must, in flesh and blood—

even by martyrdom, if so be the will of God—show forth the Right Way. Thus, both by his example and by their corporateness with him in the Mystical Body of Christ, the c.o. will bring his fellow-churchmen nearer to the New Jerusalem.

(f) Christian peace, both personal and societal, is a mystery. And it cannot be consummated apart from the Sacrifice of Calvary, and especially as that is commemorated and perpetuated in the Sacraments.

By Baptism, the Anglican Christian receives grace to lay down all earthly arms and "manfully to fight under Christ's banner" (the Cross) having renounced "the devil and all his works (including war), the pomp and vanity of this wicked world, and all the sinful lusts of the flesh."

In Confirmation, he ratifies these things in his own will, and is received, by the imposition of the Bishop's hands, into the "Priesthood of the Laity," strengthened by the gift of the Holy Spirit, and fully prepared for his duties and responsibilities as a churchman—including that of peacemaking.

If he transgresses against this divine grace after Baptism, he will voluntarily and fully confess his sin, not to a secular psychiatrist, but to the Church, either publicly (as was the primitive discipline) or at the hands of a priest, and receive spiritual as well as mental release from his guilt, devoutly confident of the merits of Christ's Passion and of the prayers of all the saints—and fellow-sinners—who have gone before. Thus he can keep his own soul in peace and readiness, freed from the madness of this world.

In Holy Communion, having cleansed his hands and heart of all evil, he is



grafted into the life-stream of the Lamb of God, whose death made all other blood-shedding useless as sacrifice and abomination and Antichrist as a means of redeeming this lost and sin-sick world.

In extreme illness, he may seek not only medical attention, but spiritual peace and healing and anointing with oil, according to the injunction of St. James and the provision of the Prayer Book.

In Holy Matrimony, he enters a state symbolic of and participant in that perfect love of Christ for his Church which St. Paul and the author of the Apocalypse describe and about which St. Bernard of Clairvaux wrote so warmly. Without the peaceful Christian home, peace in the world can have no roots and bear no seed.

And, should he be called to the Priestly Office, he will not be disobedient to the voice of God, but take up his cross and follow without delay. For the Parish Church, where all may "gather at the Father's Board" and "eat the Bread that lives beyond the tomb," is still the purest leaven in society; and without this purity there can be no peace.

So, through the whole course of life, by outward symbol and by inward grace, he can grow in holiness, abiding in the Lord's peace, showing forth to all men the Lord's death "until He come."

### III. PRACTICAL

(a) Remembering that his "citizenship is in heaven," the Anglican c.o. will first of all cultivate the vision of the New Jerusalem, as pictured in the Apocalypse and in the hymns of St. Bernard of Cluny. He will not become confused and suppose that humanistic reform

alone will bring in this perfect Kingdom of Peace, for the reign of Antichrist comes in when the "Isms" triumph. Yet he will not withdraw completely and become selfishly quiescent or politically non-effective. He will go forward in all things, remaining loyal and obedient to Christ and his Church, through which he holds his heavenly citizenship, striving to keep her, both by example and by prophetic witness, continually renewed in faith and life, and strong in the Spirit to withdraw her blessings on the State if it is or becomes pagan, or to confirm whatever tends to the just and peaceful ordering of society, in economics, sociology (especially in race relations), theology, and politics. He will seek to bridge differences among his fellow c.o.'s. He will associate himself with some effort toward cooperative or radical religious Community, working for reconciliation and humble equality on all sides, and diligent in the works of mercy. He will not stint in the stern rebuke of all vice and inconsistency, especially among the clergy. He will seize every opportunity to speak against church-supported military schools. And, more positively, he will do his utmost to make the world—the whole world—truly Christian, working and praying for purity and peace among all progressing Christians, and the peaceful conversion of all men to the Person of Christ and the Way of the Cross, knowing that in Jesus of Nazareth the love of God and his peace, and the love of neighbor and peace in the world are one and the same thing, both for the individual and for the corporate company of the redeemed.

(b) Personally, he will heartily welcome any suffering or disgrace incurred by his witness to the Prince of Peace. Conscious of Christ dwelling in his heart

by faith, he will strive to eliminate all violence and hatred from his personal relationships; and with ever increasing fervor and zeal and patience, he will pray and work for perfection in all things, "awaiting the earnest expectation of the saints," "counting as dung the wisdom of men," obedient to the voice of God in his own soul, in the ministry of his Church, and in the revealed Word of God. What he professes with his lips he will show forth in his life. In thought, word, and deed, the glory of God and the victory of peace will be his only concern. For the redemption of the world, the salvation of souls, and the sanctification of the faithful, he will present himself, body and soul, to be "a living and reasonable sacrifice," as the least he can do for Him

who "first loved us" and died that we might have everlasting life and the "peace that passes all understanding."

O Lamb of God, that takest away  
the sins of the world. . . .  
Grant us thy peace!

#### SUGGESTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

*The Book of Common Prayer; The Hymnal, 1940*; Nicholas Berdyaev, *Slavery and Freedom* (Scribners); Herring, *The Fall of Christianity* (FoR publication); Harthill, *Into the Way of Peace* (FoR publication); Hershberger, *War, Peace, and Non-resistance* (Herald Press); Temple, *Christianity and the Social Order* (Penguin ed.); *The Centrality of Christ* (Morehouse); Inge, *Christian Mysticism* (Methuen), also recent miscellaneous essays; Underhill, *Mysticism* (Methuen); Froude, *Life and Letters of Erasmus* (Scribners); Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity* (Everyman ed.).

## PERSONAL EVANGELISM

By SAMUEL M. SHOEMAKER

Calvary Church, New York

### THE NEED

It has become respectable to talk about evangelism in the Episcopal Church, but this does not mean that many of us have progressed very far in doing much about it. We are inclined to be more sure about what kinds of evangelism we do not like than we are about what kinds we do like, and our judgments in the matter are more likely to be dictated by taste than by the test of effectiveness. There is something a little ludicrous about a group of clergy gathered somewhere, and passing enthusiastic resolutions about the urgent need for evangelism, many of whom would be quite unable to function in any actual evangelistic capacity. A few of us take a trial at it now and then, but how often do we fall back upon our "incomparable liturgy" as our best appeal to people, forgetful of the fact that the whole organized system of the Church, liturgy, sacraments and all, is only meant to function for those who have contracted to live the Christian life! No one can believe that these means and methods, however important in their own sphere, can be the persuasive and evangelizing force that causes people to want to live the Christian life. Because we do not realize this, and do not learn to draw more people to Christian faith and life and service, we are denying to them the inestimable privileges which our Church has to offer.

The need today is stark. As ancient moorings and securities are swept away,

as thousands of people become centered in themselves because they have no God in Whom their faith can center, the poverty of their inner lives and their tendency towards neuroticism increase. One minister of our Church spends from nine till two each day talking, he says, with "patients"—his own people, and others who seek him out, practically all of whom are partially sick in body, mind or spirit. Psychiatrists are everywhere busy, but cannot by their "science" alone provide the faith and joy in living which have been given to us in the assurances of the Christian Gospel. These needs constitute our challenge and our supreme opportunity, for they are our doorways into human lives. Such people are open and ready for that combination of informed and intelligent counselling, plus convinced and related Christian evangelism, which makes the most effective dealing with human personality today. These people can be the future of our parish churches if they are handled rightly. The Church will itself greatly benefit by the infusion into it of more persons who come in because of a clearly recognized need, to which need the Gospel and its answer have been fitted by careful spiritual workmen. We suffer in our parishes from lack of new blood, from too much dependence on the same old crowd, from working only with what we have, and with no fresh incentive and no new levels of expectation.

We all will accept the simple state-

ment of the late William Temple that "Our training for the ministry has been too exclusively pastoral in its outlook and insufficiently evangelistic; that is to say, it has aimed at enabling men to foster the spiritual life of those who are within the Church, but has not sufficiently equipped them to make appeal with power to those who are outside."

Obviously this is not a matter of "churchmanship." We all suffer from the lack of evangelism, amongst our own church people as well as amongst outsiders. We all are responsible for countless other souls for whom Christ died, some of whom certainly have been put off by our want of spiritual power and our inability to relate our faith to their need, even when they came and presented that need to us. Many so-called "Evangelicals" are evangelical in name and "position" only—they are not actually evangelistic in their lives and in their ministries. Evangelism means action, evangelicalism may mean nothing more than a point of view, which is like nothing so much as the smile without the cat! And many deeply "Catholic" men and women possess far more actual evangelizing zeal and knowledge and technique than do the present-day Evangelicals. The need, the responsibility, the urgency, include us all, and all of us must ask ourselves what we are doing about reaching those who are outside the Church and away from the influence of Christ.

Certain kinds of evangelism do not seem to "go" in this time. The big tent and the loud speaker and the sawdust trail belong to another day. The purely dogmatic theological approach, which does not take time to canvass the actual situation of the individual, is also a thing of the past. Most of us would

not dignify by the name of evangelism the mere drumming up of numbers for the roll of church-membership: and this has its Anglican version of bringing them to Confirmation with little or no conversion-content to it. But three kinds of evangelism are open to us, and we must make use of them. The *parish mission*, led by a converted man with God in his heart and a knowledge of human nature, can do much to revivify the life of the parish, and draw into it some who have been strangers to it. The "*cell*" or small, informal spiritual company appears almost to be a characteristic expression of the work of the Holy Spirit in our time; and in it we see, not alone some converted individuals in one place, but (what is much more important), individuals standing in a *converted relation* to each other: converted relations are more impressive today than merely converted individuals. And then there is the one type of evangelism that never was out of date, and never will be, for it was singularly our Lord's own method: the touch of one life upon another, *spiritual work with individuals*, "personal work," by whatever name you call it, and in whatever effective way you get it done. It is with this last type that this article is concerned; and we are not so much at pains to describe it as to provoke in the reader a greater desire to do it, and to try to offer him some concrete help concerning the "how."

#### THE INTERVIEWER

It is a bromide to say that the interviewer must himself be a converted man if he would bring the experience of Christian conversion to one with whom he counsels. However that experience may have come, whatever "sudden" or

"gradual" elements it may contain, it must have been for him a decisive and life-transforming experience. Henry B. Wright used to say that no man can "ooze" into a Christian experience. It has been truly said that we can grow *in* grace, but we cannot grow *into* grace: the latter is a step, an act, a decision. If an interviewer is going to be able to say with Ezekiel, "I sat where they sat," then he must have sat there—he must have been a person with a conscious problem, must have faced his own responsibilities for having brought about the problem and his own sins as contributing to it, must have turned to God with penitence and determination to live a new life, and must have laid hold of those "means of grace" which he will soon be commending to his hearer. Perhaps something like this has occurred more than once: but the initial step, the place where one actually begins to lay hold of Christian experience, is what thousands are waiting to know today. We shall again and again be driven back to what has happened to us, and have to say with humility but with assurance, "This one thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see."

But this must be balanced by the constant consciousness that we are not perfection standing on one side of a line, and speaking to imperfection on the other: we are ordinary men, with problems, some of them still on the way to being solved, who stand ever under the same judgment of God as confronts all human beings. Every deep perception of what constitutes the need in another must throw light also upon ourselves: every decision which another makes in our presence must be one which we make with him in God's Presence. Kierkegaard says, "Christendom has done

away with Christianity, without being quite aware of it. The consequence is that, if anything is to be done about it, one must try again to introduce Christianity into Christendom."<sup>1</sup> Not first into pagans and outsiders and unbelievers, but *first* into us Christians ourselves. The words which we often say in a kind of mock-humility we need to lay much to heart: "we must be converted over and over again."

We shall be dominated by one or other of two emotions as we proceed to help others spiritually: by the will to love, or by the will to power. We shall feel ourselves superior, on trial, under pressure, perhaps hurried—or we shall feel compassionate, with nothing to "prove," but only a desire to share our own experience and faith and a will-to-help. The will-to-power will try to force its own solutions, the will-to-love will evoke them from the other person. The will-to-power will hardly hear what the other says, the will-to-love will be in silent listening much of the time. The will-to-power may reveal principles, but the will-to-love will open up insights in both ourselves and the other. The will-to-power may solve the immediate problem, but the will-to-love may win and transform the person. Everything depends upon whether God's Spirit can come through a released and loving human spirit, or whether we are so much in the grip of a good determination, or a good 'method,' or perhaps the pattern of some past experience, that we do not allow this experience to be a fresh gift from God to us and the one whom we seek to help.

A good interviewer must know the secret of constant prayer—prayer that keeps letting the present power of God

<sup>1</sup> *Training in Christianity*, p. 39.



into the situation moment by moment. We ought to be in prayer before we come to an interview, long blocks of prayer if we can manage it, but many brief prayers in any case, so that we are steeped in Christ's Spirit before we presume to come within the sacred confines of another human soul. And as we listen to his story with the front of our minds, we need to be listening to God with the back of them, so that He may pour in His power, love and insight, and make of this a time, not when another human being is conscious that he talks with an expert counsellor, but when he is made aware of the living God, with Whom therefore he can come into touch himself. Unless all this is given to us, and comes through us, we shall work too much by our human powers. "As I hear I speak."

As we listen to God receptively, we must listen to the person we would help creatively. A few provocative questions, something to cut off too much "recall," or to bring the conversation back on the track, yes: but no "speeches," none of those broadsides of our latest intellectual effort in a sermon or book, no parade of learning, and not too detached a silence either, but a resolute setting of ourselves to the need and mood of the other person. If we are at leisure from ourselves, if this is not a "case" but a life in trouble, if we can call out the story, the reactions, the deepest feelings of one whom we would help, he will already have begun helping himself by talking. The thing will clarify as it becomes externalized. We must learn to be at home in the deep places of human souls. Otherwise we shall be merely exchanging ideas, which have little healing in them. God took the abstract Word and it "was made flesh": we so often take the now

concrete Gospel, vaporize it into ideas, so that "the flesh is made word." Every word we speak must correspond with an experience—that will keep the word flesh.

How much shall we draw on our own spiritual experience? There are two schools of thought. One says, not at all, for no two people are alike, and the intrusion of your own story will muddy the water—keep detached from it all, and let the counsellor ring his problems and thoughts against your mind almost as if it were neutral. Sometimes this is essential, especially where some measure of true authority on your part may help to build up confidence. The other school of thought says, yes, use your own experience where it will help to make him know you understand him, and may point a possible way out—though not *necessarily* the way out for him—and to create faith. We are not simply counsellors of human wisdom, we are Christians committed to our Lord, who believe that in Him alone is found the solution to human problems and the fullness of life for which all are seeking. In this, witness must surely be free to have a place.

Is not such dealing with individuals too specialized for any but clergy to do it? It may be well for laymen to keep in touch with clergy about it, especially when they come into contact with complicated situations or those involving real mental sickness. That is, provided the clergyman himself has some knowledge of these things, as many have not. But in its more ordinary forms, this kind of evangelism is peculiarly adapted to laymen. They can often reach other laymen better than clergy can. We have too much restricted laymen to the routine, mechanical and financial side of

the Church's work. William Temple said, "The main duty of the clergy must be to train the lay members of the congregation in their work of witness." It needs to be said, however, that no clergyman will do a very convincing job of training his laymen to do evangelistic work if this means he is trying to palm off on them work which he does not know how to do himself, and will not trouble to learn. If he will do this *with* his laymen, then they will catch it from him.

#### THE INTERVIEW

We shall talk with two kinds of people. One has taken the initiative and openly asked for help, while with the other we have taken the initiative and are seeking to bring to him Christian faith and experience. We must learn how to get on board with each of these people. Dr. Fosdick says a man is like an island, and sometimes you have to row all around him before you find a place to land. Even one who has come on his own may have fear and misgivings in his mind about what we shall do: he will be drawn along as we create an atmosphere of friendly, informal, non-professional welcome and interest. We may break the ice by some such disarming remark as, "I don't know whether I can help you with what is on your mind, but I should like to try, if you feel you can tell me what it is." In the case of one whom we seek out, we need to proceed more indirectly. A good way is to find some situation which he is interested in bettering, tell him a story about how much a situation has yielded to a Christian approach (this means we must be fortified with many such stories with modern connotation and relevance), bring it back to its in-

evitable source both of trouble and of cure, namely human relations and human character. Then the field is open to suggest that he might find the remedy and bring it into the situation. If we are in touch with men and with life, it will do more to win confidence than anything else.

Once rapport has been established, he will feel free to talk about what is most on his mind. He may not come to the point at once: much depends on our creative listening. We must have time to hear him out, not stopping to point out where this or that was a wrong turning or interpretation. We want him to clear his mind. The emphasis is on him now, on what he is thinking about—not on us and the answers we may later help him to find.

Most people do not understand themselves well, nor the laws that govern life. The difficult situations which bring them to us seem to them unjust, thrust on them by others, and next to impossible to solve. There must come into our talk some reference to the moral fixtures and spiritual assurances of Christian faith, not dogmatically expressed, but rather assumed, as offering a clue to the answer. Every untoward situation arises from the ignorance or disobedience of these laws: and the solution lies in a return to them. We will often remind people that there are two factors in every situation: (1) what happens, over which we may have little control, and (2) how we take what happens, over which we have almost entire control. To see where they have been partly or wholly responsible for the situation in which they find themselves is to ask them to grow up, to admit some guilt in what has happened, and to face the future in a new way. We must take

them past evasion and self-pity and on to the assumption of mature responsibility. We must not, however, make decisions for them or ask them to accept our interpretations, except as these jibe with their own deepest insights.

But here comes the crux of the matter—and a parting of the ways for humanistic counselling and Christian evangelism. For humanists believe the answers to our problems lie in ourselves, and Christians believe they lie in Christ. Christians believe in sin, and it is easy to help a person to see where sin is just the difference between what Christ would have a man do, and the mistakes and follies he commits when on his own. We ought to know how to say the word "sin" in an interview, not as if a cloud had come over our faces, but as if a light had shined in our minds—for "sin" means we are responsible, and therefore there is an answer to the solution which we can find with God's help. Someone truly said that "we take hold of God by the handle of our sins." Our responsibility for one wrong situation should lead us to consider a life with wrong foundations, and thence to a thorough examination of ourselves in the light, say, of the Commandments or the Beatitudes. It will often help if we will get the person to make an honest, itemized list of his own faults and sins. And this, when he comes to Christian decision, will fill it with moral and spiritual content. Keep in mind the three main drives in most people's lives: money, sex and power. Deal with them so that you do a thorough job, and do not merely deal in isolation with the particular problem that has been presented. Most people never make a significant Christian decision because they have not been helped to prepare for it adequately.

What is a "Christian decision"? Clearly the most important element in it is what Christ does for us—His initiative, His forgiveness, His regeneration. But we have our part, too. It consists in our entire surrender of ourselves to all we know of God and His will as revealed in Christ. It may at the first have little conscious theological content, but this will grow as we grow in grace. People need to be shown what this decision means: the rooting out from life of whatever is contrary to God's will, the planting into it of spiritual habits, and a new kind of God-centered human relations. Often we should lead them right into decision as we talk with them. Suggest you get on your knees and both pray aloud. "Pray out loud? Never did such a thing in my life!" "All right—this is a good time to begin—forget me—think about God and your own needs and tell Him about them." Suggest he puts his sins and decision into clear words in prayer. Keep all this natural and human, while great reverence is in your heart. One delightful pagan was praying aloud in a rather ambitiously long first prayer, and in the midst of it turned side-wise to me and said "How'm I doin'?" I told him, "Very well, keep on till you're through."

Then we are in position to ask him to begin to live out what he has undertaken and to make use of those Christian "means of grace" which sustain and develop it. Some of them will be:

(1) Restitution to any whom he has wronged, apology to family, business associates, neighbours—those who have been hurt by any wrongs in the past. This offers a great opportunity, also, to initiate a witness for Christ, for they

will usually be surprised at such costly honesty.

(2) Regular habits of daily devotion. Both the Bible and the Prayer Book will become new mines of spiritual help and direction, as people become committed to the life which they describe and foster. Other books can be suggested to them. The Prayer Book has been called "the language of converted people."

(3) Membership in some Christian Communion. I think we need to beware of too swift a discussion of denominational issues—I saw a missionary bishop once lose a man to another church because, while the man had just been converted to Christ and was burning with enthusiasm about Him, the good bishop got into a criticism of other churches than his own. The man was bewildered and disgusted—and joined another church. We had better strengthen whatever church-loyalty exists—if any!

(4) Spiritual fellowship. Every live Christian needs some more informal, spontaneous companionship with other Christians than is offered by the services of the Church. Every parish ought to have a "cell" where men may help one another, where women may help one another, and where the pooling of Christian experience brings encouragement and needed corrective and growth.

(5) Life-investment on the basis of God's will. Young people especially will need to consider both their life-work, and their marriage, as no longer merely private affairs, but as being part of the plan and will of God for them, needing therefore to be made part of their surrender to Him.

(6) Reaching other individuals. One who is on fire with Christian faith will

long to make it real to others. He may be shy about it at first, and need technique and help: but we must urge him to do it, stay by him as he tries to do it. We need many individuals, clergy and laymen, who can be used to bring Christ to others.

(7) Application of Christian principles in daily work. One individual can hardly swing a company policy at once: but he can draw about him a "cell" of men who are concerned about the welfare of the company, and its responsibilities; talk with them about their relations to one another, and the whole labor-management situation; bring them up to a new level of thinking and planning; and slowly infiltrate the company with Christian life and action. This is being done in many instances. And no man is truly converted whose daily life and work do not show the difference.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- How to Make an Evangelistic Call.* By Seward Hiltner (Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York, New York).
- The New Evangelism.* By Henry Drummond, esp. the essay on "Spiritual Diagnosis" (out of print).
- New Testament Evangelism.* By Arthur C. Archibald (Judson Press).
- New Day for Evangelism.* By Aaron N. Meckel (E. P. Dutton).
- It's Time to Re-think Evangelism.* By Aaron N. Meckel (E. P. Dutton).
- A Workable Plan for Evangelism.* By Dawson Bryan (Abingdon-Cokesbury).
- A Larger Evangelism.* By John R. Mott (Abingdon-Cokesbury).
- Abundant Living.* By E. Stanley Jones, esp. pp. 267ff. on how to create and conduct Christian calls (Abingdon-Cokesbury).
- How You Can Help Other People.* By S. M. Shoemaker (E. P. Dutton).
- Home Visitation Evangelism, A Manual for Laymen.* By William McCullough.
- It Works.* By Melvin J. Evans.

*He Sent Them Two by Two.* By Gowan Williams ("Forward in Service," 281 Fourth Avenue, New York, New York).

*Plan of Action, 1947-1949* (Presiding Bishop's Committee on Laymen's Work, 281 Fourth Avenue, New York, New York).

*A Way of Brotherhood* (Presiding Bishop's Committee on Laymen's Work, 281 Fourth Avenue, New York, New York).

#### QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

##### I. *The Need*

1. Why is the Episcopal Church so weak in Evangelism?
2. With the shocking decline in our Church in Sunday School attendance, do we not need to find a practical means of Evangelism immediately? (cf. account of National Council

meeting figures in *The Living Church*, May 4, 1947; Vol. CXIV, No. 18, p. 3).

3. What means are open to us all?
4. Is example enough?

##### II. *The Interviewer*

1. What qualities are needed in an effective worker?
2. Can laymen disregard this work or "leave it to the clergy"?
3. Have you ever brought anyone to Christian decision and experience?

##### III. *The Interview*

1. With what kind of experiences should the interviewer's mind be stocked?
2. Can we reconcile "counselling" and "evangelism"?
3. What further needs to happen to us before we begin to do this work?



## THE HAND OF GOD IN HISTORY

By GEORGE W. EDWARDS

Hartsdale, New York

A thoughtful person cannot help but look upon the events of our time with a deep sense of awe. He realizes that he is living in one of the great moments in history. In no period throughout the entire course of the human race have such sweeping events taken place within so short a span of time. In scarcely a third of a century have occurred World War I, the devastating depression of the nineteen thirties, World War II and its aftermath, the atomic age. Truly we live in a solemn moment of history.

Have these events any meaning at all? Can they be viewed in a relationship that gives them some pattern and some sense? Can we look upon the tragedy of modern war with its waste of life and its destruction of all we hold dear, as well as world-wide depression with its futility and human misery, and see any purpose in it all?

To many thoughtful persons the events of our time, or in fact of all history, are nothing more than a sequence of hopelessly confused, irrational, senseless and purposeless episodes—"a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

Dreisser writes: "Whatever a man does is something that can only prolong the struggle and worries and for the most part the futile dreams of those with whom he finds himself companioned here in this atomic welter. . . . I catch no meaning from all I have seen, and pass as I came, confused and dismayed." A sorrowing father of a young French army officer, killed in 1940, cries: "What kind of a world is this in which half

of each generation must be killed in order that the other half may live the remainder of their years in a confused post-war world of reconstruction and readjustment."<sup>1</sup> For those countless millions who have lost their loved ones, for those who have returned maimed from the scourge of war, for those who face disease and starvation in war's aftermath, for those who see only the spectre of another universal depression and World War III, is there any satisfying explanation?

The Hebraic, and also the Christian, religion offers an answer by maintaining that the events of history are the acts of God. A higher power—call it the hand of God—intervenes in man's affairs and shapes his destiny.

God moves in a mysterious way

His wonders to perform.

He plants his footsteps in the sea

And rides upon the storm.

So writes the poet William Cowper.

But is it possible to square this traditional belief with the actual facts of history? Can such an explanation of the events of our time be honestly accepted in the light of all we know from the studies and researches of modern social science? Can this age-old interpretation of history be reconciled with the findings of the social scientist?

A social system is made up of so-called institutions. These are the habits or ways of doing things, which in the course of time have become widely ac-

<sup>1</sup> Roswell Barnes, quoted in *Christian Imperative*, p. 7.

cepted by a group of people. In ancient times the Greeks developed the political institution of the city-state. After the fall of the Roman empire, the people of Western Europe gradually worked out the military system of feudalism, and modern Europeans have created the national state. Likewise man developed economic institutions such as land-cultivation by the plough, ocean-transportation by the trireme, and industrial production by the machine. A social order in time comes to be known by the name of its leading institution. The social structure of the ancient world is usually called the city-state system; the medieval order is generally known as feudalism, and the modern era as capitalism. Each term expresses what social science, for the most part, considers the dominant institution of the social order. It must, however, be remembered that a social order is made up of a number of other institutions.

Over the many centuries, one social order has followed another. In the perspective of history they seem like the waves of the ocean rolling in ceaselessly one after the other on a long sandy beach. In the wake of the already receding wave, the new one rises, reaches its crest, breaks, and in turn recedes in the rise of the next. In like manner a social order first emerges amidst the decline of a previous one. In the developmental stage the institutions attain their fullest growth; then comes the crest or the maturity of the system. After that the system enters the late or declining stage when it disintegrates within the rise of the succeeding system. More accurately, some of the institutions of the older system disappear altogether and are replaced by those of the new order, while other institutions continue

in modified form. In either case the "old order changeth, yielding place to new."

Why does a social order pass and become only an historical memory? This question was in the mind of the archeologist, Edward Chiera, as he climbed one night to the top of a ruined tower of an ancient Sumerian temple, and in the light of a full moon looked over the vast Mesopotamian plain which once teemed with countless thousands of inhabitants and now lay completely deserted. "Why should a flourishing city, the seat of an empire, have completely disappeared?" he meditated. "Is it the fulfillment of a prophetic curse that changes a superb temple into a den of jackals. Did the actions of the people who lived here have anything to do with this, or is it the fatal destiny of mankind that all its civilizations must crumble when they reach their peak."<sup>2</sup>

The most profound explanation of why a social order falls is found in the writings of the great Hebrew prophets. Like us in the twentieth century, they lived on one of the great divides in history. In the eighth and seventh centuries B.C., empires were falling, civilizations were decaying, and new orders were being born. The great seers of Israel and Judah, keen observers of the events of the day, were able not only to discern the underlying meaning of these events but also to point out their inevitable outcome in the future with remarkable accuracy. This has been the task of the prophet in every period of history. Karl Marx ably performed this function in the middle of the nineteenth century, and he may truly be regarded as possessing a partial revela-

<sup>2</sup> *They Wrote in Clay*, preface.

tion for his time. The great Hebrew prophets of the ancient world possessed complete revelation from God in that their message is indeed universal—for all time and for all social orders. This ever-contemporary nature of the social message of the prophets may have been in the mind of George Bernard Shaw when he wrote: "A great deal of the Bible is much more alive than the morning newspaper and last night's Parliamentary debate."<sup>3</sup>

Like western Europe in the nineteenth century, the eastern Mediterranean in the eighth century B.C. was passing through a sweeping cultural change. The political, technological, and economic institutions of the ancient culture were being drastically transformed. In northern Palestine the kingdom of Israel was developing into a powerful city-state governed by an aristocracy of warriors and priests. It was a period of considerable technological advance due to the growing use of iron which provided better domestic tools and also better war implements. Although most people lived on the soil, a growing number were now engaged in trade.

These institutions of the new order brought advantages to Israel. Her military power not only protected the lives and property of the Israelites, but was also strong enough to exploit some of the surrounding communities. In Samaria, the capital of Israel, the increased technological knowledge built palaces which rivaled those of Tyre and Damascus. Trade with Phoenicia and Egypt provided luxuries and comfort for the upper social groups and added to their wealth.

The new institutions also brought evil consequences. Where formerly society had been comparatively equalitarian, it now became sharply divided. The upper class alone enjoyed the comforts of the new civilization. The lower class was crushed under heavy taxes and often reduced to serfdom. The international trade of Israel rested on an unsound foundation. It consisted mainly of the importation of high-priced luxury articles which could be purchased only by the exportation of low-priced agricultural products. This exportation reduced further the meager food supply available for the poor. The economy also lacked outlets for capital. When the merchant reached the maximum return possible on his commercial operations, he had few outlets for his surplus capital in other fields. Industry offered no such opportunity, and land was about the only form of investment. The plots of the small farmers were bought up and formed into vast estates for the rich. The small farmers either continued on the land as serfs or drifted to the towns and cities where they eked out a miserable existence as casual laborers. The military and commercial aristocracy completely controlled the legal system and handed out justice to suit themselves.

The first and most uncompromising critic of the evils of the Israelite social order was the prophet Amos. Standing in the market place of the holy city of Bethel, on a fall holiday, the prophet shocked the celebrants by his denunciations. The conspicuous consumption of the upper class was scored in this searing indictment: "They who lie on ivory couches and sprawl upon their divans and eat lambs from the flock and calves from out of the stall; they drawl to the

<sup>3</sup> Lowry, Charles W., *The Trinity and Christian Devotion*, p. 132.

sound of the lyre, they drink bowlfuls of wine and anoint themselves with the finest oil—but they grieve not over the ruin of Joseph” [the lower classes] (Amos 6:4-6). In the mouth of the dishonest commercial class, impatiently waiting for the passing of the holy days, Amos put these words: “When will the new moon begin that we may set forth wheat, making the weight small and the shekel great and falsifying the balance by deceit, that we may buy the poor for silver and the needy for a pair of shoes?” (Amos 8:5-6). The sins of the social order would inevitably cause its destruction. Amos thus describes his vision of doom: “The Lord stood upon a wall made by a plumbline, with a plumbline in his hand; and the Lord said unto me, ‘Amos, what seest thou?’ and I said, ‘A plumbline.’ Then said the Lord, ‘Behold, I will set a plumbline in the midst of my people Israel. I will not again pass them by any more. . . . The end is come’ ” (Amos 7:8-9).

This prophecy was received with ridicule, for the people saw only their military power, their improved technology and their prosperous materialism. This self-confidence was expressed by the (high) priest Amaziah who sharply rebuked Amos. The nation was sure in its self-sufficiency. To the Israelites who had long looked forward to what was known as the “Day of the Lord,” it was to be a time of national glory and a new golden age, when the enemy would be crushed and when Israel would attain even greater political and economic heights. To Amos however the Day of the Lord was to be a time of defeat and disaster. “Woe unto you that desire the Day of the Lord! To what end is it for you? The Day of the Lord is darkness and not light” (Amos 5:18).

The responsibility for the fall of a social order rests upon a people as a whole. Hosea, like the other great prophets who came later, refused to place the blame on the acts or misjudgments of a particular ruler. Not individual but corporate responsibility, not personal but social sin destroys a culture. “The Lord hath a controversy with the inhabitants of the land,” declared Hosea, “because there is no truth nor mercy, nor knowledge of God in the land” (Hosea 4:1).

His book is a remarkable study in social psychology and provides a profound interpretation of the forces of social decay. He expressed his belief in the maturity of the social order in the descriptive words that “strangers have devoured his [Israel’s] strength, and he knoweth it not; yea gray hairs are here and there upon him, yet he knoweth it not” (Hosea 7:9). He realized the inconsistency of a social order which had developed its institutions, but exercised insufficient control over them, and described Israel as “a cake not turned” (Hosea 7:8). His abiding contribution to social ethics was his interpretation of social sin as a national habit (Hosea 4:1; 5:12). The cause of this national sin was a lack of the knowledge of God (Hosea 6:6). He attacked the deadly evil of the pride of his people who, confident in their material prosperity, could declare: “I am become rich, I have found me out substance; in all my labors, they shall find in me no iniquity that were sin” (Hosea 12:8). He denounced the materialism of the intellectual classes of his day in his charge that the “priests thereof teach for hire, and the prophets thereof divine for money.” Hosea offered the solution of the social problem. Society could be

healed, not by material forces, but only by complete moral change. He therefore urged upon the nation: "Turn thou to thy God, keep mercy and judgment, and wait on thy God continually" (Hosea 12:6). Hosea had little hope of such regeneration and prophesied: "For they have sown the wind and they shall reap the whirlwind" (Hosea 8:7).

Before the end of the eighth century the prophecies of Amos and Hosea had been fulfilled, for Israel was overwhelmed by the Assyrians. Archeologists, digging amid the rubble of Samaria, now pick out the blackened ruins of ivory beds and the crushed remnants of jewelry—reminders of the conspicuous waste of an early culture.

The southern kingdom of Judah passed through a similar social evolution, like that of the northern realm of Israel. The political and economic power of Judah rose to its height in the seventh century. Neighboring countries were overrun and even seaports were captured. The kingdom experienced a rapid commercial expansion with increased wealth and splendour. As in the case of Israel, these new institutions were directed to evil ends.

In all the history of social philosophy there has seldom been a greater figure than the prophet Isaiah. As a member of the ruling class of his day, he exercised considerable influence over the political policies of Judah, and his statesmanship served his people well in a trying time. More important for us was his penetrating analysis of social evolution. In his writings is found the clearest statement of the doctrine of the hand of God in history. Again and again, in ringing words Isaiah affirms his conviction that God has a definite plan for peoples and races. "The Lord of hosts

hath sworn, saying, 'Surely, as I have thought, so shall it come to pass; and as I have purposed, so shall it stand' . . . this is the hand that is stretched out upon all the nations" (Isaiah 14:24, 26). The individual is unimportant in shaping the course of history. For a time some leader may shake his puny fist at God, but such a gesture is futile. In the early seventh century, Nebuchadnezzar seemed veritably to bestride the earth. To such a man, according to Isaiah, God says: "Is this the man that made the earth to tremble, and did shake kingdoms, that made the world a wilderness, and destroyed the cities thereof? Yet shall he brought down to hell, to the side of the pit" (Isaiah 14:16-19).

An underlying moral weakness in a social order, according to Isaiah, is the sin of pride. Although a member of the intellectual class of his day, he saw the danger which lies in a self-satisfied rationalism. "For the wisdom of their wise men shall perish," he declared, "and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid" (Isaiah 29:19). In social philosophy, self-satisfied rationalism is usually accompanied by false optimism. Isaiah, like Amos, saw this twin social sin which refuses to face the stern reality that the social order is disintegrating. Of his own people, Isaiah writes: "This is a rebellious people, lying children which say to the seers, 'See not,' and to the prophets, 'Prophecy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophecy deceits'" (Isaiah 30:10-11). Isaiah, putting his finger on the underlying cause of false prophecy regarding the future of a social order, declared: "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, 'Hearken not unto the words of the prophets that prophecy unto you; they speak a vision out of



their own heart and not out of the mouth of the Lord" (Isaiah 30:10-11).

The most unyielding spokesman of the lower class was Micah. One would have to search far and wide in the radical literature of all time for more bitter invectives against the abuses of a social order than in the utterances of this ancient Jewish prophet. He was the champion of the small peasants who were being crushed by the avaricious land gentry. "They covet fields, and take them by violence; and houses, and take them away; so they oppress a man and his house, even a man and his heritage" (Micah 2:2). He condemned the rich who exploited the poor "who pluck off their skin from off them, and their flesh from off their bones" (Micah 3:1).

Toward the close of the seventh century an attempt was made to check the evils in the social order of Judah. The so-called Deuteronomic reform, under the well-meaning King Josiah, sought to overcome social inequality, and aimed at social righteousness. Poverty was to be eliminated, for the hope was expressed that "there shall be no poor" (Deuteronomy 15:4). "Thou shalt open thine hand wide unto thy brother and to thy needy in thy land," was the command of the new social code. "Thou shalt not oppress a hired servant that is poor and needy" (Deuteronomy 15:11; 24:14).

Social righteousness, solemnly accepted by the nation under Josiah was later violated. Bond-servants, instead of being released, were held in subjugation (Jeremiah 34:8-16). The lower classes were oppressed as harshly as before, and were often deprived of their rights. Jeremiah told the upper classes that "they are become great and waxen rich . . . they prosper; and the right

of the needy do they not judge" (Jeremiah 5:27,28).

Jeremiah diagnosed the underlying cause of the disintegration of Judah's social institutions. The decay of the system was due to the spiritual weakening of the nation. Through Jeremiah, God declared: "My people have committed two evils; they have forsaken me the fountain of living waters, and hewn them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water" (Jeremiah 2:13). This spiritual decline affected all classes. Not only the poor and uneducated, but the educated groups alike were guilty, for even the "great men . . . have altogether broken the yoke and burst the bonds" (Jeremiah 5:5).

To Jeremiah the destruction of the nation was inevitable. Repentance was no longer possible, for "can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? Then may ye also do good that are accustomed to do evil" (Jeremiah 13:23). As a result, Jeremiah prophesied the destruction of the very temple of Jerusalem. In their blind rage against Jeremiah's forecast of doom, the ruling classes imprisoned him. Hananiah, the prophet of optimism, spoke the words which the ruling classes wanted to hear, viz. that peace and prosperity were to be the destiny of Judah (Jeremiah 28:9). Against such prophets Jeremiah cried, "I have seen also in the prophets of Jerusalem a horrible thing, they walk in lies, they strengthen also the hand of the evil-doers" (Jeremiah 2:3, 16). These prophets were crying "Peace, peace, where there is no peace. . . . We looked for peace, but no good came, and for a time of healing, and behold dismay" (Jeremiah 8:11; 6:14).

With the overthrow of Assyria, the empires of Egypt and of Babylonia

strove for the mastery of the Eastern Mediterranean. Under Nebuchadnezzar the Babylonians crushed the Egyptians and their dream of world-power came to an end. In the words of Jeremiah, "The mighty man hath stumbled against the mighty, and they are fallen both together" (Jeremiah 46:12).

Ezekiel was the prophet of both destruction and reconstruction. He foretold of the rich that "they shall cast their silver in the streets and their gold shall be removed; their silver and their gold shall not be able to deliver them in the day of the wrath of the Lord" (Ezekiel 7:19). The forecast came true, for the Babylonians captured Jerusalem and carried a large part of the population, especially the wealthy class, into exile. The function of the prophet is also to lay the ethical foundation for the new order. Ezekiel was among the first to perform this task. His plan of reconstruction was based on the principle of social justice (Ezekiel 46:9-11). Ezekiel urged that no attempt be made to go back to the past. He advised: "Cast away from you all your transgressions, whereby ye have transgressed; and make you a new heart and a new spirit" (Ezekiel 18:31).

The unknown prophet, who for want of a better name is called the "Second Isaiah," provided the most significant contribution to the period of transition from the old to the new order. He gave the solution to the problem of reconciling the suffering of the Jewish exiles with the thought of an all-powerful God. To the Second Isaiah, the sufferings of the Jewish people were an expiation for the sins not only of Judah but of the other nations. Judah, the suffering servant of the Lord, was the agent of salvation for all nations. Suffering was part of the

plan of social reconstruction, and in this light the great movements of history could be understood. To those who held true to the faith, the Second Isaiah offered hope: "Comfort ye my people . . . speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned; for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins" (Isaiah 40:1, 2). The prophet believed that the people had endured enough suffering, and relief was near at hand. In the final restoration, as a later prophet saw, "God will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people shall he take away from off all the earth" (Isaiah 25:8).

The "Third Isaiah" established the standards of the new order. It was not to be a return to the old order, but to be a new system. "For, behold, I create a new heaven and a new earth; and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind" (Isaiah 65:17). In the new era, war was to be banished, for the nations "shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more" (Isaiah 2:4). The new order was not to be national but universal in its scope (Isaiah 45:23; 63:8). It was to be not material, but of a far greater glory.

In the light of these utterances of the great prophets we may now attempt to state briefly a religious interpretation of the evolution of a social order. The events of history have an underlying purpose, and form a definite design or pattern. This is true because God takes an active part in the affairs of social groups. Each has a definite rôle to play

on the stage of history. Each social group has, however, complete freedom of will and can make its own choice of its actions. Thus while God knows the general course of the drama of history, he leaves the acting to the players. They may perform their part well or poorly according to their own desires. The will of a social group may for a time shape the course of history, but in the end it must follow God's will.

The underlying factor in history is therefore spiritual in nature. The evolution of a social system is governed fundamentally not by economic and political but by moral and ethical forces. As mentioned before, a social order is made up of institutions. As long as these institutions continue to serve a good purpose, the social order as a

whole grows and develops. When these institutions are directed to evil ends, the social order disintegrates.

Therefore, as institutions grow, it is essential for society to develop a correspondingly growing ethical power to control the ends to which its institutions shall be directed. When the development of such control lags behind the growth of institutions, the social order inevitably disintegrates, and within the framework of the dying order there rise the institutions which serve better the needs of society. The religious interpretation of history holds that social institutions are directed to evil purposes when they run counter to God's will. Institutions serve best the interests of society when they are in accordance with divine purpose.

## THE RESTORATION OF HOPE

By HOWARD HENRY HASSINGER

Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

One way of delineating the Christian character is to put it in terms of virtue. That is the line of approach that runs through Ambrose, Augustine and Aquinas. These authors indeed start at the periphery with the virtues of classical antiquity—Justice, Fortitude, Temperance and Prudence, but they press on into the innermost citadel to the distinctive Christian responses of Faith, Hope and Charity. In the process, as T. B. Strong points out,<sup>1</sup> the Cardinal Virtues are thoroughly Christianized by relation to the Theological Virtues.

The Theological Virtues, however, form a complete group. In St. Thomas' opinion this is mainly because they have God for their object, but also because they elicit and employ all the powers of a man. Accordingly the omission or mistreatment of any of them will distort the whole character of the Christian.

In recent times Hope has been receiving this careless handling. F. P. Harton calls it the Cinderella of the Theological Virtues and adds, "Faith we know, Charity we know, but with Hope it is different."<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless in his as well as in other writings on ascetical theology in our day Hope gets slim treatment in proportion to the whole treatise. Indeed in Kenneth Kirk's *Some Principles of Moral Theology* it has almost completely disappeared, being replaced in the desiring side of human nature by Penitence.<sup>3</sup> The books

form but one line of evidence for the general interest of that period out of which we are passing rapidly. It was *this-worldly*. To be sure, genuine Christianity is always deeply interested in this world. What happened however in the liberal age was such a serious shifting of the center of interest that the *world to come* was all but completely crowded out of the frame of reference.

Reinhold Niebuhr in his *Discerning the Signs of the Times* deals briefly but adequately with the cause of this mood. "There are periods of historic achievement," he writes, "in the life of mankind, just as there are periods of fulfillment in the lives of individuals, when the problem of frustration does not arise as a serious issue."<sup>4</sup> As late as 1912 so good a theologian as Walter Rauschenbusch could think that the major work of establishing the new order of the Kingdom of God in this world had been done.<sup>5</sup>

Now, however, that problem of frustration does arise. The gap between the social tasks laid upon us and the power to perform them widens. We can neither effect the international order demanded by our technical civilization nor secure the economic justice within the nations that will bring security *with freedom*. The mixture of good and bad motives, of generosity and pride, which actuate ourselves and our associates, our friends and our foes, is too intricate for our understanding, to say nothing of

<sup>1</sup> *Christian Ethics*, p. 141.

<sup>2</sup> *The Elements of the Spiritual Life*, p. 43.

<sup>3</sup> P. 44. Moral and Ascetic Theology are treated as one subject in this book.

<sup>4</sup> P. 54.

<sup>5</sup> *Christianizing the Social Order*, p. 124.

our mastery. Intolerable resentments are formed. "Russian intransigence," "British imperialism," "American pride" are but a few of the judgments which call them forth. More and more there steals over men's hearts the chilling realization that we do not have the moral and spiritual resources with which to bring about anything better than a tolerable stability. We have decades, perhaps centuries, of abortive efforts to which to look forward.<sup>6</sup> The incurable optimists will deny this but developing circumstances will prove them wrong. It is better to face the situation and prepare for the future realistically.

That preparation means the recovery of perspective. The fulfillment of human life is *beyond time*. The Kingdom of God is *completed only in eternity*. Men's hearts as well as their gaze must once again be directed to *the world to come*. In other words it is time to examine once again Christian Hope. It may not be unfruitful to do this with the aid of the distinctions which come to us through the line of Christian thinkers with which we began.

"The object of Hope," says Aquinas,<sup>7</sup> "is good in the future difficult but possible to be had." Both difficulty and possibility are essential to the definition. The good can be gained. It may be lost. Arctic explorers and sailors afford stock illustrations. As the hungry and weary explorers approach the place where they know food has been stored for them their imaginations bring the treasured meat before their eyes and mouths and this spurs them on to fresh efforts to

make their way through the deep soft snow. When the seafaring men see the beacon light of the harbor they gain heroic strength to guide their battered ship through the raging sea and the fierce wind. The Epistle to the Hebrews makes use of this latter kind of imagery to exhort us to "lay hold upon the hope set before us, which hope we have as an anchor of the soul both sure and steadfast and which entereth into that within the veil, whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus"—and incidentally it supplies us with the traditional symbol of this virtue, the anchor.<sup>8</sup>

When Hope is lifted to the Theological level it is seen by St. Thomas in true Aristotelian fashion to be the mean between two extremes, Presumption and Despair. Both vices issue from self-centeredness, the first through overweening self-confidence and the second through failure to put confidence anywhere else but in self. If we fall into the one, we imagine ourselves so strong that we can secure the object of our desire or so good that it must be given to us; if we fall prey to the other, we deem the object no longer obtainable because we are too weak and feel that there is nothing left worth while. From this proceeds fear and *possibly* bravado.

The reaction to Presumption is of course, Penitence. Spiritual writers have always perceived that there will be deepening Penitence in a growing Christian life. As the light of the knowledge of God's goodness and patience spreads, our misdoings assume new proportions. We may be moved in the beginning by a terror of the consequences of our acts, a terror which is called "servile fear." We proceed however at length from

<sup>6</sup> The whole of the chapter on "The Age between the Ages" in *Discerning the Signs of the Times* should be read.

<sup>7</sup> Rickaby, *Aquinas Ethicus*, I, p. 337; *Summa* 2, 2, Q. 17 A. 1.

<sup>8</sup> Hebrews 6: 18-20.



"the fear of a servant" to the "fear of a son." We become ashamed to have hurt a father who is so good. But not our misdoings only but the imaginations of our hearts as well take on new dimensions. Revision and purification of desire is in constant process. We seek not so much to fashion things nearer to to the heart's desire as to fashion the heart's desire nearer to the desire of God.

Important as deepening Penitence is, it nevertheless does not absorb the *whole* of the desiring side of spiritual life. Desire must be directed to that which "*exceeds* all that we can desire." We continue to *hope*.

The reaction to Despair is regained confidence, overcompensating in Presumption or more temperately stopping at Hope.

With the next distinctions we reach the constructive phase. Hope has both an *object* and a *base*. Both call for extended consideration.

"The object of Hope is good in the future difficult but possible to be had." "The good that we properly and principally should hope for from God is infinite Good which is in proportion to God aiding us. Such good is life everlasting which consists in the enjoyment of God himself."<sup>9</sup> Undoubtedly St. Thomas sees the heart of "life everlasting." There is no Heaven for any man apart from attachment to God and no happiness without the joy of His radiant beauty and inexhaustible love. But is this a *sufficient* statement of the object of Christian Hope? Reinhold Niebuhr makes explicit the misgivings that many men have long had about it. Catholics and Protestants alike, he

points out, have had too individualistic a conception of Heaven. Exactly. We can follow him in his next criticism namely, that we can be too definite in our delineation to be convincing. Many Christians have been so in the past. At the moment however our danger lies in being too vague. With profit and decency we can make more of the social concepts in the New Testament, as Niebuhr himself does with one of them in "the City which hath Foundations."<sup>10</sup> We may speak of the realization of the Purpose of God, the gathering into one of all things in Christ, the fulfillment—the perfection of humanity—in the stature of the fulness of Christ, the mystical body of the Redeemer completed in the glorified body, the triumph of the Kingdom, the rejoicing multitudes, the fellowship of the saints in light, the endless alleluia.<sup>11</sup>

With a recent philosopher, A. E. Taylor, we may speculate on the continued activity of the saints in their sharing of the joy in fresh discoveries of God's goodness and glory.<sup>12</sup> We can dwell on the strength of the final assertions of creed. "I look for—*expecto*—the life of the world to come." More can be made than we have been making of the church seasons of Advent and All Saints, especially All Saints. Indeed more can be made of the festivals of individual saints *as living persons*. Then there are the great medieval hymns of the Celestial City—Jerusalem the Golden "that *eager hearts expect*." For a summary we may quote William Temple's words, "This universe is governed by a mind which has adopted as its end the fullest

<sup>9</sup> Rickaby, *Aquinas Ethicus*, I, p. 338.

<sup>10</sup> *Discerning the Signs of the Times*, p. 73.

<sup>11</sup> Vide J. O. S. Huntington, *The School of the Eternal*, p. 34.

<sup>12</sup> *The Faith of a Moralist*, I, pp. 408 ff.

realization of love—meaning by that the mutual fellowship of spirits wherein they find their chief delight in all that binds them one to another.”<sup>13</sup>

Hope must make copious use of imagination. “Foretastes of glory divine” spur us on in our earthly pilgrimage. Even as we make the attempt however we know that human imagination and human imagery is inadequate to the task. God has prepared “for them that love Him such good things as pass man’s understanding.”

Thus we are brought to the other distinction, the *base* of Hope. This surely lies in nothing less than the nature of God. That is where our Lord in the days of His ministry placed His assurance that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were still living.<sup>14</sup> That is where St. Paul found it when he made the assertion that “nothing—neither life nor death—can separate us from the love of God.”<sup>15</sup> Eternal life is the *gift* of God.<sup>16</sup>

Indeed as spiritual life develops there is an increasing readiness to forgo all speculation about the nature of the world to come in the confidence that “God will take care of us.” That surely lies behind Bickersteth’s words, “Our future all unknown, Jesus we know and He is on the throne,” and those of the Spanish 17th century hymn, “My God I love thee, not because I hope for Heaven thereby.”<sup>17</sup> In the language of the Evangelicals, this is “trusting in” or “standing on the

Promises.” Here is where the interdependence of Faith and Hope appears. The confidence in God is of course an aspect of Faith. Yes, and of Charity toward God also, since it is His love to us that elicits our confidence and gives rise to our love.

Such a *base* for Hope cuts the ground from under any form of Presumption, not only that of gaining Heaven by our efforts or our goodness but also of “bringing in” or “building up” the Kingdom of God by human ingenuity, prowess, or righteousness. “It is the Father’s good pleasure to *give* you the Kingdom.” The Kingdom is a phase of that “infinite good which is in proportion to God aiding us.” Such a basis is that onto which those in despair must be brought.

A Christian Hope that is merely secular has not only ceased to be Christian,<sup>18</sup> it has ceased or will soon cease to be a hope. The confusions of the present age will produce alternating moods of facile hope and deep despair. In the immediate juncture we scarcely know what to plan for *as Christians*. As Stringfellow Barr says in *Christianity takes a Stand*, Civilization might be added to us if we sought first the Kingdom of God. To that we append the interpretation, *if we sought the Kingdom that is completed only in eternity*. It is said of the saints that “their works do follow them.” Nothing done here in the name and in the spirit of that Kingdom can ever be lost from its completed structure. With this expectation we

<sup>13</sup> *Christianity in Thought and Practice*, p. 56.

<sup>14</sup> St. Luke 20: 38.

<sup>15</sup> Romans 8: 39.

<sup>16</sup> William Temple in *Nature, God, and Man* so regards it, p. 463.

<sup>17</sup> *The Hymnal 1940*: 436 and 456.

<sup>18</sup> J. B. Scaramelli quotes an interesting line of St. Augustine: “Those blessings alone are objects of the theological virtue of hope which are contained in the Lord’s prayer.” *Directorium Asceticum*, IV, p. 49.

are placed beyond the reach of the sense of frustration and futility.

When then men are confident that their "labor is not in vain in the Lord" and that ultimately "all things work together for good to them that love God," they have reached the source of that moral and spiritual power so sadly lacking today and so sorely needed for the work of the morrow. Here is the basis for the courage to face continually disagreeable tasks, to persevere in the presence of discouragement and to take risks in hours of danger. The martyrs

bear witness. In short, here is that Cardinal Virtue which T. B. Strong has asserted had become completely Christianized by its relation to Hope, that is Fortitude.

When Hope is restored to its proper place and dimension in the scheme of virtues to be expected in and cultivated by every Christian, the Christian character will be furnished for the tasks of the new age—or indeed for any age—and will be fitted for its place in the eternal habitations.

## LITURGICAL UNIFORMITY AND ABSOLUTISM IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

By DAVID HECHT

Oratory of St. Mary and St. Michael  
Cambridge, Massachusetts

and GEORGE L. MOSSE

State University of Iowa

The modern concept of institutional uniformity was foreign to the Middle Ages. To be sure, at the summit of the mediaeval order, we have the Pope and the Emperor, but beneath the pinnacles of universal Church and Empire a great variety of local customs flourished. Localism, as opposed to centralization, was the hall mark of the mediaeval epoch. The liturgy of the Church shared in the general pattern of civilization.<sup>1</sup> While it is true that Charlemagne attempted to obtain some sort of uniformity in liturgical matters, "the old freedom to compose and use local propers was hardly affected by Charlemagne's reform."<sup>2</sup> Until the era of the Reformation, rubrics in the Mass, for example, were mere reminders of what might be done.<sup>3</sup> It should be added, however, that a certain "blending" of different rites did, in the end, occur in the Frankish empire.<sup>4</sup>

Even in the early part of the sixteenth century, Papal directives dealing with ceremonial and liturgy never had the

quality of outright "command." When Pope Clement VII, for example, approved the new hymnal of Ferreri, he did not command, but merely allowed the clergy to use that book. When Pope Paul III, in his turn, approved the shortened breviary of Quignon, it was again on a voluntary basis. "Rome seemed to desire that this form of Office should be adopted, but, on the other hand, it feared to make its adoption a law."<sup>5</sup> Men like St. Francis Xavier and Caraffa refused to accept this greatly shortened breviary. But forty years later, in 1558, Pope Pius V condemned the breviary of Quignon and "ordered" it abolished throughout the Western rite.<sup>6</sup> Here we find a definite change in tone. No longer was the Papacy afraid to make "laws" regarding liturgy.

It was, of course, the Reformation that in great part wrought this change. But at least one other and basic factor must be considered. Just as the mediaeval liturgy, with all its variations, was an integral part of mediaeval civilization, the new spirit of uniformity seemed to coincide with the rise of a new, more centralized order in the West. Was the search for uniformity in matters liturgical not then a very real part of the

<sup>1</sup> Pullan goes so far as to use the term "liturgical anarchy" in this connection. Leighton Pullan, *From Justinian to Luther* (Oxford, 1930), 67.

<sup>2</sup> Dom Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (Westminster, n.d.), 585.

<sup>3</sup> Walter H. Frere, *The Principles of Religious Ceremonial* (London, 1906), 161.

<sup>4</sup> E.g. the old Roman with the northern elements, Leighton Pullan, *op. cit.* 83.

<sup>5</sup> Dom Prosper Guéranger, *Institutions Liturgiques* (Paris, 1878), 357, 362.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* 409, 420.

growing political and economic centralization that dominated the sixteenth century?

The Reformation was itself linked with the rise of the new Leviathan. Indeed, the increasing secularization of the Papacy played a vital part in the break from Rome. More and more, the Pope had become a temporal prince among other Italian rulers. One spiritual weapon after another had degenerated into an instrument of Italian power politics. Crusades were no longer preached against the Moslem infidel, but, rather, against emperors such as Frederick II who menaced the worldly patrimony of St. Peter. Even the Indulgence became bound up with the acquisition of earthly lucre.<sup>7</sup> All this was part of the rise of a new age. When Venetian bankers and French kings were trying to fill their coffers to overflowing, why then should the rulers of the patrimony of St. Peter not do likewise? The men of commerce and trade were now beginning to dominate the scene instead of the Lords and Knights of old, who, by and large, had been expected to "live off their own." The Church might traditionally have taken a disapproving stand against usury, but the Papacy had in reality long condoned it. For both the casuist doctrines of *damnum emergens* and *lucrum cessans* coupled with the actual practices of Papal financing—the latter especially under the shrewd guidance of the financial wizard, Pope John XXII—carried the Papacy ever more closely into harmony with the new age.<sup>8</sup>

The chief political results of this tremendous upsurge of commerce and trade were the new nation states of the West. And even where no national unity emerged, as in the case of Germany and Italy, small principalities and city-states behaved as if they were little nations.<sup>9</sup> Within these new nation states of western Europe, we may observe the trend toward centralization which was finally to lead to the absolute monarchies of the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries. The police state, where all power was concentrated in one dynasty, where all commercial activities were closely regulated by the crown, was to be the outcome of these new forces which shattered the mediaeval polity.

There seems little need to demonstrate how the Reformation contributed to this process. It was the German princes, of course, who supported Martin Luther—in part at least—because it would allow for centralization of Church power in their own hands. Contrariwise, the reason why Francis I did not persecute the French Roman Catholics, but harried the Calvinists instead, lay in the fact that he already possessed vast powers over the Church in his country through the theory of Gallicanism. From another point of view, it was only political common sense that a Reformer like Luther would seek shelter behind those princes who desired greater centralization in their realms and who vigorously opposed Charles V's grandiose plans to revive the Empire. "The great reformers were not actuated by a conscious striving for nationality, but

<sup>7</sup> Norman Sykes, *The Crisis of the Reformation* (London, 1938), 43.

<sup>8</sup> For a discussion of this see William Cunningham, *The Growth of English Industry and Commerce* (London, 1910), I, 225-260.

<sup>9</sup> See the brilliant discussion by E. W. Nelson, "The Origins of Modern Balance of Power Politics," *Medievalia et Humanistica*, I, (1943), 124-42.



the aspirations of their political allies and the course of events gave the Reformation everywhere a strongly national character."<sup>10</sup>

But other than merely political reasons existed for Luther's support of the princes. Magistrates stood not only *in loco parentis*, but also *in loco Dei*. The ruler was the right arm of the Church, for were not all believers bound by a common Priesthood? The ruler, so far as the Church was concerned, was thus virtually on an equal footing with any Minister of the Faith.<sup>11</sup> There is therefore, logically, a renewed stress placed upon "the powers that be" as "ordained of God." Luther, at one point, indeed went so far as highly to praise the Duke of Saxony's estimate of Charles V: "God has given us this Emperor either for Grace or for Damnation."<sup>12</sup> All this paved the way for the *landesherrliche Kirchenregiment*. Yet Luther himself did not believe that the polity and ceremonial of the Church should have the force of binding law upon all believers. Here, as we shall note later, is a certain significant similarity between Luther's attitude toward liturgical matters and the course of Anglican development.

In Luther's *Deutsche Messe*, he specifically disclaimed any intention of making his order of the Mass a law. Nor did he want to prejudice those who already had their own church order. In this connection, the German Reformer appealed to the past. It never happened,

he correctly asserted, that the order of the Mass in all cloisters or parishes had always been the same. In any case, he declared that the external order was nothing; the spirit only counted.<sup>13</sup> Yet here, Luther, by his very emphasis upon the inner spirit as against the external order, was playing into the hands of the *Landeskirchen*. The Prussian Church order of 1525 started out with these words of the Elector: "Dear brethren, . . . it is our duty because of our office to look with care to the spiritual regimen and to the good order of the Church. . . ." He then specifically disclaimed, as Luther had, any desire to restrict the liberty of the Christian man. But, on the other hand, the Elector wished that worship might proceed in an orderly manner and that all might act and behave alike!<sup>14</sup> This then was the latter's concept of Christian unity. In the same year, the city fathers of Straslund were equally outspoken. It was the duty of the secular authority, they insisted, to order the Church in such wise that Christian life could be lived in "harmony" or uniformity.<sup>15</sup>

Hence, in spite of Luther's assertion to the contrary, the principle of uniformity became the decisive characteristic of these state churches. The liberty of the Christian man was, in truth, to be inward only. Obviously the growing trend toward centralization in European political life played its role in this regard. Protestant politicians of Melancthon's stamp feared nothing so much as the charge of sedition.<sup>16</sup> In fact, after 1648,

<sup>10</sup> Frederick Hertz, *Nationality in History and Politics* (London, 1944), 118.

<sup>11</sup> Franz Hildebrandt, *Melancthon: Alien or Ally?* (Cambridge, 1946), 56.

<sup>12</sup> "Gott hat uns diesen Kaiser gegeben zu Gnaden und Ungnaden," *Dr. Martin Luthers Tischreden oder Colloquia*, ed. Friedrich v. Schmidt (Leipzig, 1878), 282.

<sup>13</sup> Aemilius Ludwig Richter, *Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des Sechzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig, 1871), 36.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.* 28.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.* 25.

<sup>16</sup> Franz Hildebrandt, *op. cit.* 56.

it even became permissible to establish Lutheran Churches under the direction of Calvinist rulers, provided that these princes recognized and signed the unaltered Augsburg Confession. Within this, often very flexible, limitation, the Calvinist prince then attended to the good ordering of the Lutheran Church.<sup>17</sup>

Lutheranism thus fitted in with the rise of the new monarchies, with eventual absolutism in politics and national uniformity in matters of liturgy. But what about the now dangerously threatened position of the Roman Catholic Church? It surely was a supra-national power, a Church not dependent upon the prince's will. For the Tridentine profession of faith reaffirmed the stand that Boniface VIII had so strikingly assumed in his Bull *Unam Sanctam*: outside the Church, no salvation was possible.<sup>18</sup> And the Church was a self-contained institution with the Papacy as its spiritual head, but with a mediaeval tradition of liturgical diversity. The tightening of the liturgy and the concept of uniformity were elaborated by the Church as defense measures against rampant Protestantism. The Council of Trent no longer "suggested and approved"; it "stated and declared," for example, that the Vulgate was to be recognized as the only true Scripture.<sup>19</sup> The rubrics of the Mass were no longer reminders of things to be done, but they contained, instead, minute instructions.<sup>20</sup> Books which even so much as ventured to dispute the find-

ings of the Fathers at Trent were to be examined and expurgated.<sup>21</sup> The Church had now armed itself with the weapons of the Index and the Inquisition.

The existence of the Index underlined the fact that the printing press was an important factor which forced the Church to insist on some kind of uniformity, if only to oppose the books that might propagate outright heresy.<sup>22</sup> The movement of the Reformation, however, forced the Church to go much further. Here again there was uniformity, and, at the same time, that centralization which became such an integral part of European political life. When Pope Pius V ordered the abolition of the Quignon breviary, he appended to it "a schedule of conformity," as it might well have been called. All those in Rome had to conform within one month. Within three months, all who lived on the Italian side of the Alps had to fall into line, and those living in the Trans-alpine regions, within six months. Moreover, only at Rome could the now authorized breviary be printed.<sup>23</sup> Here was uniformity with a vengeance!

How do these facts relate to the Anglican experience? Too often the Church of England has been regarded as something outside the main current of the liturgical trends in western and central Europe. It was not only in England, as we have already indicated, that uniformity was "imposed" from above. The

<sup>21</sup> Carl Mirbt, *op. cit.* 261.

<sup>22</sup> Dom Gregory Dix, *op. cit.* 588, points this out, but fails to link liturgical uniformity to the general pattern of the age. The manner in which the printing press was used by "heretics" like Luther is discussed by Louise W. Holborn, "Printing and the Growth of a Protestant Movement in Germany," *Church History*, XI (1942), 123-137.

<sup>23</sup> Dom Prosper Gueranger, *op. cit.* 423.

<sup>17</sup> H. H. Kramm, "Organisation and Constitution of the German Protestant Churches," *The Church Quarterly Review*, CXXXVIII (1944), 88.

<sup>18</sup> Carl Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des Roemischen Katholizismus* (Tuebingen, 1911), 259.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.* 211.

<sup>20</sup> Walter H. Frere, *op. cit.* 161.

sixteenth century was to be, after all, a century of uniformity. The German *Landeskirchen* and the statements and binding declarations of Trent testify to that fact. We might also add the "rule according to the Institutes" established in Geneva.

The Church of England had its immediate origins (as an independent national church), to be sure, in the matrix of the general European political situation—especially in the menace of the Hapsburgs, for whom Catherine of Aragon was such a loyal agent in England.<sup>24</sup> The liturgical development of Anglicanism must also be viewed as part of the larger picture. Men like Archbishop Cranmer did not think of themselves as isolated innovators, but rather as a very real part of the "Common Corps of Christianity."<sup>25</sup> In the matter of liturgical development, the Anglican Church too was intimately bound up with the fate of Christianity in an age of absolute monarchy. And this was so, despite the fact that many of the most sensational changes in prescribed ritual, ceremonial and doctrine occurred in the troubled times of the Protectorates of Somerset and Northumberland. Yet, although the English Church is usually cited as the example of a State Church, in many respects it fell short of the Tridentine or even of the Lutheran concept of uniformity. Just as the Tudor

monarchy was not an "absolute monarchy," uniformity in the Church in matters of ceremonial, doctrine and liturgy did not present a picture of absolute conformity.<sup>26</sup>

England in the late Middle Ages reveals the same proliferation of liturgical "uses" to be found in the rest of western Europe. While the Sarum rite, intimately connected with Salisbury, had become quite widespread, the differing rites of Hereford, York, and Bangor, to mention but three, were far from unimportant one the eve of Henry's breach with the Roman See.<sup>27</sup> The ensuing swift and sometimes almost chaotic shifts in Prayer-Book liturgy in the age of the English Reformation were unable to stamp out entirely the older diversities, despite the growing movement for an "English" liturgy, which had gathered such strength by the sixteenth century.<sup>28</sup> This latter trend meant, above all, a shift from the Latin to the English language (e.g. the English translation of the Bible of 1538 and the English Litany and Communion Devotion) and the elimination of the influence of the Papal curia upon the liturgy.<sup>29</sup> The corollary to the destruction of Roman supremacy in Eng-

<sup>26</sup> See George L. Mosse, "Change and Continuity in the Tudor Constitution," *Speculum* XXII [Jan. 1947] pp. 18-28.

<sup>27</sup> *Liturgy and Worship*, ed. W. K. Lowther Clarke (London, 1923), 135.

<sup>28</sup> Sir Lewis Dibdin, *Establishment in England* (London, 1932), 35.

<sup>29</sup> An interesting sidelight on this issue is presented by the fact that Irish priests could not understand English. Hence a Latin translation of the second Edwardian Prayer Book was actually sanctioned shortly after Elizabeth ascended the throne. The first Prayer Book of 1549 had already been translated into French for use in Calais and the Channel Islands. Francis Proctor, *A History of the Book of Common Prayer* (New York, 1868), 36-37.

<sup>24</sup> Catherine of Aragon and the whole question of Henry's divorce have received excellent treatment in Garrett Mattingly, *Catherine of Aragon* (Boston, 1940).

<sup>25</sup> Franklin L. Baumer, "The Church of England and the Common Corps of Christendom," *Journal of Modern History*, XVI (1944), 1-20. "Cranmer was always afraid of the isolation of his church," C. H. Smyth, *Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI* (Cambridge, 1926), 35.

land was the political enforcement of national uniformity—either with or without the consent of the Convocation of bishops—the governing body of the Church of England. A certain disparity was always, however, present between the political uniformity demanded from above and the actual lack of uniformity within the liturgies of the Anglican Church. In this restricted sense then, we may safely assert that England too was travelling the road to uniformity.

Already late in the reign of Henry VIII, the beginnings of significant, royally authorized reinterpretations of doctrine took place, for example the Ten Articles of 1536. The great liturgical landmarks in the sixteenth century were, however, the Edwardian Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552, and the Elizabethan Prayer Book of 1559. While all these documents contained pronounced shifts away from mediaeval Catholic ritual, ceremonial, and doctrine, nevertheless, they were all permeated by ambiguities—many probably deliberately inserted—which were to permit a relatively large degree of latitudinarianism within English “national Protestantism.”<sup>30</sup> And, as we shall observe, unlike the example of the Lutheran Church, all attempts to establish rigid liturgical uniformity before 1662 were to fail. What occurred was the passage by Parliament of a succession of Acts of Uniformity which provided for conformity to the various Prayer Books promulgated. This governmental insistence upon and enforcement of allegiance to a given liturgy (even though this liturgy would itself shift) forges the connection between Anglican developments and the corresponding movements on the continent.

<sup>30</sup> Henry Offley Wakeman, *The History of the Church of England* (London, 1908), 279, 280.

There is a striking similarity between the words of the Elector of Prussia, quoted above, and the sentiment expressed in the Preface to the first Prayer Book of Edward VI: “Let all things be done amongst you, sayth St. Paul, in a seemly and due order.”

Thus the first Act of Uniformity provided that every minister after Whitsunday, 1549, was to use the new Prayer Book exclusively in the “celebration of the Lord’s Supper, commonly called the Mass,” under penalty of fine, deprivation, and eventual imprisonment.<sup>31</sup> Despite this apparent harsh “intolerance” of reasoning which demanded that “the whole realm should have one use,”<sup>32</sup> the rubrics of Cranmer’s Prayer Book were silent on many crucial issues such as ceremonial, in this way leaving much room for variation in liturgical interpretations by clerical incumbents. At the same time, this law permitted liturgical prayer services other than the Mass, in Greek, Latin, or Hebrew, to be publicly used in the universities.<sup>33</sup> None the less, the First Book of Common Prayer was “imposed” not only upon England, but upon Ireland as well by this law which opened “a new chapter in English Church history corresponding” to the “new wave of thought . . . passing over the whole of the western Church.”<sup>34</sup>

As has already been suggested, the Prayer Book of 1549 lasted but a relatively short time. Not until 1661–1662 was the “final” form of the English

<sup>31</sup> *A Dictionary of English Church History*, ed. S. L. Ollard and G. Cross (London, 1912), 606.

<sup>32</sup> *The First and Second Prayer Books of King Edward The Sixth* (London, 1913), 4.

<sup>33</sup> Francis Procter, *op. cit.* 22–23.

<sup>34</sup> Henry Offley Wakeman, *op. cit.* 273.

liturgy enshrined in a Book of Common Prayer that has lasted in the Church of England down to our own day. Yet every one of these documents contained significant omissions, lacunae, and ambiguities which have allowed enough room for such highly diverse later developments as the Oxford and Evangelical Movements of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.<sup>35</sup> Similarly, at least one of the homilies meant to accompany and amplify the Articles of Religion—that on Justification—was never written at all, a fact which encouraged the condition of Anglican doctrinal and liturgical “roominess.”

In the age of so-called Tudor absolutism, however, the Acts of political uniformity, in contrast to strictly liturgical developments, not only continued but even increased in stringency. Unlike the Act of 1549, which “did not affect the laity at all,”<sup>36</sup> the second Act of Uniformity in 1552 not only attempted to enforce the use of Cranmer’s now decisively Protestant Prayer Book of the same year upon the clergy; it also compelled attendance of the laity at the revised religious services. According to this law, recusants were to be punished by ecclesiastical censures and separatists to be imprisoned after the verdict of a jury.

Ten years later, following the passage of the Elizabethan Act of Supremacy by Parliament, a third Act of Uniformity, making the new Prayer Book of 1559 the only legal service-book, retained provisions for severe punishments of resu-

sants and separatists.<sup>37</sup> Yet, significantly enough, at this time “the liturgical situation was one of utter confusion.”<sup>38</sup> The era of the Restoration was to witness a full system of civil and religious disabilities inflicted upon non-conformists and Roman Catholics (e.g. the Conventicle Act of 1664 and the Test Act of 1673). Hence, while the Prayer Book of 1662 remained substantially that of 1559, at last the concept of necessary liturgical uniformity based upon that Prayer Book coincided with the program of political uniformity in religious matters undertaken by the restored Stuarts.<sup>39</sup> And this political program was equal to, if not more severe than that embraced in the policies of Henry VIII and his pre-Revolutionary successors. Yet even these policies of liturgical and political uniformity were to break down by the mid-nineteenth century. The gist of the matter was that one had to be an Anglican—a practicing member of the State Church, and not a Papist or Dissenter—under pain of strict punishments. But the crucial question remained, and exists even today when we find both Catholic and Protestant parties fiercely contesting within the Church of England: what was an Anglican? And on this point, even the Thirty-Nine Articles spoke ambiguously.<sup>40</sup>

Only as the effects of the Puritan Revolution were to become visible late in the seventeenth century, would the

<sup>35</sup> E.g. for a vividly written presentation of the doctrinal splits that threatened to shatter the Church of England in the nineteenth century, see Compton Mackenzie’s novel, *The Altar Steps* (New York, 1922).

<sup>36</sup> Henry Offley Wakeman, *op. cit.* 274.

<sup>37</sup> M. W. Patterson, *A History of the Church of England* (New York, 1912), 282, 283. But this Act was not uniformly enforced at all. Its “elasticity . . . in certain directions” has been noted by one commentator. W. H. Frere, *The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I* (London, 1904), 43, 44.

<sup>38</sup> *Liturgy and Worship*, 184.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.* 196–7.

<sup>40</sup> *Dictionary of Church History*, 32.



gathering current of religious toleration slowly undermine the program of political uniformity imposed upon the realm by both Tudors and Stuarts alike. And this new trend would coincide with the triumph of Parliamentary supremacy.

The sixteenth century, then, was an age of uniformity, both politically and in matters of Church liturgy and organization. In spite of wide diversities of ceremonial practice and ambiguity of doctrine, the Church of England, in its political insistence upon the use of the Book of Common Prayer as its liturgy, by and large followed the same absolutist tendencies found in the continental Churches, both Lutheran and Papal.

In Germany, the Hitlerian State Church seemed really to succeed in summing up four centuries of concessions to power in the name of the uniformity of a *Landesherrlicher Kirche*. Reichmarschall Goering, indeed, is said to have boasted that he led the Church back to a purely priestly and non-political ministry. The National Socialist State, by taking over all the externa of the Church, had rendered it free to concentrate on its purely spiritual function.<sup>41</sup> Nevertheless, many of the German clergy were compelled to face the vital issue of the "liberty of the Christian man" as it had never before been faced in the history of Lutheranism. For the National Socialist State went far beyond even the control of the externa of the Church. Christ himself was directly attacked. None of the princes of the sixteenth century, no Hohenzollern emperor had gone to such lengths.

In the face of this challenge, many of the German clergy had to break with the State and, indeed, actively oppose its

decrees—whether the State was the enforcer of uniformity or not. Since 1934, runs one estimate, thirteen hundred of Germany's eighteen thousand pastors tasted the discipline of the concentration camp.<sup>42</sup> Fearless ministers, such as Maas of Heidelberg, were deprived of their pulpits and jailed. Perhaps now the spell of uniformity enforced by the State in all externa over the Lutheran Church will be broken. National Socialism has at long last brought home how organically related are the areas of external and internal freedom. Perhaps in this instance, as in the case of Anglicanism in the nineteenth century, more individual autonomy will eventually prevail, although Pastor Niemoeller's defense of the German war effort still leaves grave doubts as to whether Germany will be able to rid its Protestantism of the heritage of the age of submissive uniformity. As is well known, even in a political democracy like Sweden, the Protestant Church is rigidly controlled by the State—a control which extends indeed to the weekly sermons of the Ministers.

Ever since Trent, the Roman Catholic Church has been under the spell of uniformity. And in this case, the trend toward uniformity, already well-established, was strengthened even more by the increasing importance of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, promulgated by the Vatican Council of 1870.<sup>43</sup> It is today a truism to observe that all Roman Catholic liturgy and Church order flow from Rome. We must, however, remember that such centralization has not always existed. Here again, we have the heritage of the age of uniformity, a

<sup>42</sup> Erika Mann, *School for Barbarians* (New York, 1938), 147.

<sup>43</sup> Carl Mirbt, *op. cit.* 363-364.

<sup>41</sup> Franz Hildebrandt, *op. cit.* 63, n.I.

uniformity which tends to have political as well as religious consequences.<sup>44</sup>

The Church is part of the human society in which it lives. Liturgy and even Church order have been vitally influenced by the changing pattern of Western Civilization. Mediaeval times, dominated by local customs and conventions, saw a state of practical "liturgical anarchy." With the rise of centralization in European life, stimulated by the ascending commercial elements, and culminating in the national absolutist state, the liturgy itself became imbued

---

<sup>44</sup> William Teeling, *The Pope in Politics* (London, 1937), 64. Adrian Fortescue makes the illuminating remark in his *The Ceremonies of the Roman Rite Described* (London, 1930), XXIV, n.1, "Needless to say, I have given the rules for all these things exactly as they stand now. One may express one's hope for changes; till the authority of the Church sees fit to make such changes we must obey the rules exactly."

with the spirit of nationalistic uniformity. Apart from the greater ambiguities in liturgical matters which characterized the Anglican Church from the time of the Reformation on, Anglicanism seems to have been a genuine part of the general European pattern. But, in contrast to many of the chief European Churches—Lutheranism and Roman Catholicism especially—which are still laboring under the heritage of uniformity, the Anglican Church reflects in practice, if not quite in theory, the greater individualism of the English experience, which never really knew an absolute State. Anglicanism should be well fitted by its heritage to take upon itself a larger measure of leadership, looking towards the time when Nationalism and Absolutism in all their forms will be looked upon but as evil manifestations which accompanied a certain stage in the development of man.

## MELITO OF SARDIS, PREACHER EXTRAORDINARY

By HILLYER H. STRATON

Malden, Massachusetts

Due as much as any one factor to the discovery of a fairly complete manuscript of a sermon on the Passion, Melito of Sardis has taken his place as one of the outstanding Christian leaders of the latter part of the Second Century. Melito's ministry was contemporaneous with Marcus Aurelius. His *Apology*, addressed to the emperor,<sup>1</sup> could not have been earlier than 169. He must have died by 190, for Polycrates, in writing to Victor, Bishop of Rome, speaks of Melito in the past tense as one of the saints in the Asian church who held to the Quartodeciman<sup>2</sup> side of the Paschal controversy.

Most of his works are known only by their titles. We have a list of them in Eusebius. Some of the titles are: *On the Passion, On the Conduct and Life of the Prophets, On Soul and Body, On the Corporeality of God*.<sup>3</sup>

The *Apology* gave evidence to earlier scholars of the power intrinsic in Melito, as is seen in the following:

"This philosophy of ours certainly did flourish at first among a barbarian people. But springing up in the provinces under thy rule during the great reign of thy predecessor Augustus, it brought rich blessings to thine empire in particular. For ever since then the power of Rome has increased in size and

splendour; to this hast thou succeeded as its desired possessor, and as such shalt thou continue with thy son if thou wilt protect the philosophy which rose under Augustus and has risen with the empire, a philosophy which thine ancestors also held in honour along with other religions. The most convincing proof that the flourishing of our religion has been a boon to the empire thus happily inaugurated, is this—that the empire has suffered no mishap since the reign of Augustus, but, on the contrary, everything has increased its splendour and fame, in accordance with the general prayer.<sup>4</sup>

Harnack in commenting on Melito's abilities says,

"... his political insight is marvelous. But still more marvelous is the fact that at a time like this, when Christians were still a feeble folk, he actually recognized in Christianity the one magnitude parallel to the state, and that simply on the ground of religion—i.e., as being a spiritual force which was entrusted with the function of supporting the state."<sup>5</sup>

The present homily of Melito's on the Passion has been given exhaustive study by Campbell Bonner in a monograph published in 1940 by the University of Pennsylvania Press in the series, *Studies and Documents*, edited by the recently lamented Kirsopp Lake. Eight of the pages of this sermon are in the Chester Beatty collection and six belong to the University of Michigan. Bonner assigns the present manuscript to the Fourth Century and says that the scribe was not a technically competent workman,

<sup>1</sup> Latourette, *The First Five Centuries*, p. 531.

<sup>2</sup> The Quartodecimans were those who, following the Ephesian practice, observed a type of Christian passover on the 14th of Nisan in keeping with the Jewish dating.

<sup>3</sup> Erwin Preuschen in the new *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia*, Vol. VII, p. 290.

<sup>4</sup> Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity*, i, p. 261.

<sup>5</sup> Harnack, *op. cit.*, p. 262.

for he tended to crowd the letters toward the end of the sentences. An interesting point in Melito's style is his preference for older Attic forms rather than the common usage of the Koiné.<sup>6</sup> His language is that of the better educated man of his day. This fairly complete sermon establishes him as one of the most effective preachers among the church fathers. If his other works maintained the high standard of this message he surely would be classified among the outstanding Christian preachers of all time. The dynamic power and dramatic strength of his sermons are seen clearly in the written form and must have been far more evident when preached.

This homily is based on the 12th Chapter of Exodus where we find the account of the contest with Pharaoh and the establishment of the Passover. Melito immediately begins to drive home his point that the Passover is a type of the redemption provided by the sacrifice of Christ.

"For the Law became Word, and the old became new, going forth together from Sion and Jerusalem, and the command became grace, and the type became truth, and the lamb became a Son, and the sheep of sacrifice became man and the man became God. For born as a Son, led forth as a lamb, sacrificed as a sheep, buried as a man, he rose from the dead as God, being by nature God and man. Who is all things: in that he judges, Law, in that he teaches, Word, in that he saves, Grace, in that he begets, Father, in that he is begotten, Son, in that he suffers, a sacrificed sheep, in that he is buried, Man, in that he arises, God. This is Jesus the Christ, to whom belongs the glory to the ages of ages."<sup>7</sup>

The above is a good example of Melito's sermonic method. Our generation

does not use the Old Testament in this fashion, but the effectiveness of an adequate Old Testament comparison or analogy with the New is seen again and again in the unsurpassed preaching of the modern Scottish pulpit.<sup>8</sup> There is apparently here a conscious copying in style of John's Prologue in the first sentence of this quotation. Compare "In the beginning was the word and the word was with God and the word was God" (John 1:1) with Melito's "For the law became word and the old became new."

Melito then draws a parallel between the original Passover experience in Exodus and what Christ has accomplished. His description of the lamentation of the Egyptian first-born is particularly poignant. His main contention is:

"The Law, under which Israel lived, is to the new covenant only as a cheap and perishable pattern is to the finished work of art, splendid in design and costly in material."<sup>9</sup>

This second century preacher and observer of life goes on to show the fallen nature of man and the state of human depravity. It not only reminds us of Paul's vigorous description in the first chapter of Romans, but also the iniquity of our own day with its extermination camps and atomic destruction of whole cities. Melito's doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ is similar to that of Justin (*Dialogue*, 126-129). Christ was put to death, according to Melito, because of the Jews, who returned evil for good. Antisemitism is an ancient evil that has snared many! To Melito, Jesus Christ is the Creator. In especially dra-

<sup>6</sup> Bonner, *The Homily on the Passion*, p. 13.

<sup>7</sup> Bonner, *op. cit.*, p. 168, from ms., p. 2, lines 7-10.

<sup>8</sup> For a good example see James S. Stewart, *Gates of New Life*, Scribner's 1940. Sermon: "Sacrifice and Song."

<sup>9</sup> Bonner, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

matic fashion in picturing the crucifixion, he says:

"And so he is raised upon a high cross, and a title is set upon it making known him who was slain. Who was he? Painful it is to tell, more terrible not to tell. Hear ye, and tremble before him who made heaven and earth tremble. He who hung upon the cross, he who made all things fast is made fast upon the tree, the Master has been insulted, God has been murdered, the King of Israel has been slain by an Israelitish hand. O strange murder, strange crime! The Master has been treated in unseemly wise, with his body naked, and has not even been deemed worthy of a covering, that he might not be seen. For this reason the lights of heaven turned away, and the day darkened, that it might hide him who was stripped upon the cross, shrouding not the body of the Lord, but the eyes of men. For though the people trembled not, the earth trembled; though the people feared not, the heavens were afraid; though the people rent not their garments, the angel rent his; though the people did not lament, the Lord thundered from heaven, and the Most High uttered his voice. Why thus, O Israel, didst thou not tremble for the Lord, why didst thou not fear for the Lord, didst thou not wail for the Lord; why didst thou not wail for his (sufferings)? Why, when (he) hung on the cross didst thou (not) rend thy garments in pity? Pitiless he found thee, not (compassionate) . . . he found thee not. . . ." <sup>10</sup>

We see here the intensely powerful nature of his rhetoric. Even his strong words against Israel are tinged with the sorrow of the One who weeps over Jerusalem. There is horror at the crime of the crucifixion for he too would have gathered Israel but she would not. Melito is perfectly acquainted with the Jewish background and history and is thoroughly sympathetic with it. He quotes the Old Testament worthies with the greatest of admiration. In fact, although there are numerous definite quotations from the Old Testament, there is not a

single direct quotation from the New, although there are a number of references to the New Testament incidents and phraseology.<sup>11</sup> One such outstanding reference is to John's account of the raising of Lazarus. Melito draws from this incident exactly the same purpose that the Evangelist had in mind—the proof to Israel that the miracle was a sign of the power of God in Christ. The Jews did not accept ". . . their Messiah; nor did the most marvelous sign of all abash thee . . . a dead man buried in the tomb for four days, yet raised up by him." <sup>12</sup> Here we find a good and typical example of how and why certain gospel stories were preserved.

In connection with the style of Melito, this homily is excellent proof that he exerted a powerful influence upon early Christian preaching. It was once thought that Hippolytus and Origen were the first fathers to use artistic style in preaching. This sermon of Melito's, with its rhetorical devices, inclusion of hymns, use of parallelism and strong figures of speech, shows that he was a polished orator as well as an outstanding Christian. Notice the dramatic quality in the following: ". . . He went forth and subdued the stiff-necked Pharaoh with grief, clothing him not with the cloak of mourning . . . but with all Egypt in rent garments mourning for her first-born." <sup>13</sup> There is also vivid intensity in ". . . they were beating time to the dancing of the dead," and "Tell me, Angel, what stayed thy

<sup>11</sup> Bonner, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

<sup>12</sup> Bonner, *op. cit.*, p. 177, from ms., p. 12, line 78.

<sup>13</sup> Bonner, *op. cit.*, p. 169, from ms., p. 3, line 17.

<sup>10</sup> Bonner, *op. cit.*, p. 179—from ms., p. 16, lines 95–99.



hand—the sacrifice of the sheep or the life of the Lord?”<sup>14</sup>

One of the most interesting factors to the modern preacher is Melito's use of types. From our viewpoint it is a fine example of typology gone to seed. The representative of a certain present-day religious group specializing in what they termed "Child Evangelism" once tried to interest this author in their movement. With much evident satisfaction I was shown the Bible outlines employed, and how the children were fascinated (no doubt!) by the typology of the Old Testament. The little ones were being instructed in the Christian values in the Book of Numbers! Such misled enthusiasts might learn a thing or two from Melito, a past-master in utilizing this method for even Melito said, "The type then was precious before the truth came, the parable was wondrous before its in-

terpretation . . . but since the Church arose and the Gospel was shed abroad upon the men on earth, the type is made void, giving over the image to the natural truth."<sup>15</sup>

There is good evidence that Hippolytus as well as Origen was influenced by Melito.<sup>16</sup> In fact, Origen quoted him almost verbatim in a manner that today would cause him to be prosecuted for plagiarism. For the student of this period it furnishes an excellent instance of the freedom used by the ancients in employing the works of one another. Melito is not the only early preacher who deserves study. One sometimes wonders if our modern pulpits would not be greatly improved if there was the same acquaintance with the ancients as with the "Best Sermons of 1946."

<sup>14</sup> Bonner, *op. cit.*, p. 171, from ms., p. 5, line 29.

<sup>15</sup> Bonner, *op. cit.*, p. 172, from ms., p. 6, line 1, p. 7, line 42.

<sup>16</sup> Bonner, *op. cit.*, pp. 57 and 70.

## A NOTE ON PAPIAS

By ROBERT M. GRANT

University of the South

Two recent studies of Papias of Hierapolis illuminate his writings and should be drawn to the attention of students of the New Testament and early church history. The latest should be noticed first. This is a quite conservative treatment of gospel origins by the late R. O. P. Taylor, *The Groundwork of the Gospels* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946). Much of his little book deals with the meaning of Papias' terminology, or rather that of John the Elder. Mark "followed" Peter; this means that he was his intimate disciple, who produced his master's instructions from memory. In calling Mark "interpreter," John does not mean that he merely translated Peter's words into Greek but that like the synagogue-interpreter (cf. Acts 13:5) he acted as a translator of the scriptures, the Hebrew Old Testament, and only secondarily improved Peter's Greek. When John says that Mark drew up the lessons *πρὸς τὰς χρείας*, Taylor finds a direct reference to the Greek rhetorical form *chreia*, a "concise shrewd statement of a recollection, referred to some particular person" (Aphthonius). And the *chreia* can be developed into a parable. It is a normal form employed in Greek education (pp. 75-90).

We may observe that it would be natural for John Mark to be attached to Peter in Rome. After the conflict at Antioch, Paul had rejected his services (Acts 15:37), and Mark presumably remained with Barnabas and the pro-Petrine gentile Christians. And whether or not Sylvanus was responsible for the

good Greek of I Peter (as Selwyn argues), Peter must have needed help in his ordinary catechetical instruction. The suggestion of a definite literary form is rather attractive, for the same form—or what could be so classified—is used in the synoptic gospels (M. Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel* [New York, 1935], 152-64). And E. Schwartz long ago pointed out Papias' acquaintance with Greek rhetoric (*Über den Tod der Söhne Zebedaei* [Göttingen, 1907], 9 f). So did F. H. Colson, "Τάξις in Papias (The gospels and the rhetorical schools)" in *JTS* 14 (1912-13), 62-69. Papias may perhaps have made its acquaintance in the Johannine school, although one hesitates to associate Greek rhetoric with millenarian apocalyptic. And is the expression necessarily technical?

A recent article in *Vivre et Penser* (the wartime *Revue biblique*) by Monsignor L. Gry may provide a solution for our problem. In discussing "Le Papias des belles promesses messianiques" (*Vivre et Penser* 3 [1943-44], 112-24), Gry publishes part of his forthcoming commentary on the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch (see also his article, "Hénoch X, 19 et les belles promesses de Papias," *Revue biblique* 53 [1946], 197-206), since Baruch 29:5-6 is very similar to Papias as quoted by Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* v. 33. 3-4. But Papias contains more apocalyptic-eschatological matter than does Baruch; he rounds out the story of miraculous fertility with a question by an incredulous disciple; and he

ascribes the whole to John the Lord's disciple, an "ancient." Gry finds rabbinic parallels to Papias which go back to disciples of R. Johanan b. Zakkai (late first century), and observes that a rabbi Pappos (the same name as Papias) accompanied either Joshua ben Hanaiah (one of Johanan's five chosen disciples) or Gamaliel II to Rome in the year 95. He suggests that this "tradition" was interpolated into the work of Papias disciple of John; it really comes from Pappos disciple of Johanan.

There is clearly much in favor of Gry's hypothesis. Its acceptance might well give us greater confidence in Papias' notices of the gospels. And we may note that the Christian rabbinism of the evangelist Matthew is close to Johanan b. Zakkai; indeed von Dobschütz (*ZNW* 27 [1928], 344), following Schlatter, has suggested that Matthew was once a disciple of Johanan. But can we distinguish so sharply between Greek and Jewish modes of thought in the first and second centuries A.D.? When we recall the rabbinic tradition that Greek wisdom was studied as well as Jewish (W. L. Knox, *Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity* [London, 1944], 30 f) and the extent to which the Greek language had filtered into Palestine (S. Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine* [New York, 1943], esp. 15-28), we cannot be quite sure that the thought of Papias was so unlike that of Pappos. Two disciples of Johanan knew Greek (Lieberman, 16 ff; on the whole subject see A. D. Nock in *ATR* 25 [1943], 223 ff).

Another Jewish-Christian idea, found by Irenaeus in one of his sources, is that of the correspondence of the four gospels to the four corners of the world

and to the four cherubim (see C. Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers* [Cambridge], I, 135). The Archbishop of Quebec has pointed out to me that Irenaeus is following a special source at this point (*φησιν*, iii. 11. 8 [II, 47 Harvey]). In reproducing his source Irenaeus is not concerned with the fact that in his own view Mark is a prophetic book because it quotes from the prophets; according to his source it is prophetic because it deals with the post-incarnation period of the Spirit. The source's order for the gospels is John, Luke, Matthew, Mark. Is this a primitive sequence from Asia Minor, like that implied by the list of apostles in the *Epistula Apostolorum* 2 (p. 486 James)? Is it from Papias?

A further problem remains. If Papias was in any way associated with the Johannine school, we may wonder what he said about the gospel of John. Probably Eusebius failed to quote his views because they were commonplace. Now if we try to put the quotation from Papias in the so-called anti-Marcionite prologue to John (*ATR* 23 [1941], 241 ff) back into Greek, we get something like this:

εὐαγγέλιον [Ἰωάννου] ἀπεκαλύφθη καὶ  
ἐξέδοτο ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις Ἰωάννου ἔτι ἐν  
σώματι καθεστῶτος . . .

I suggest that we should suspect only a slightly more corrupt text than is actually the case, and read: *εὐαγγέλιον καὶ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐξέδωκε Ἰωάννης*. This has the advantage of agreeing with Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* iii. 1. 1 (II, 6 H.). It should be noted in passing that E. Gutwenger, "The Anti-Marcionite Prologues," *Theological Studies* 7 (1946), 393-409, adduces strong arguments for removing these prologues from the second century.

## THE LAMENT OVER JERUSALEM

### A RESTUDY OF THE ZACHARIAS PASSAGE

By J. SPENCER KENNARD, JR.

New York City

The Gospels seem to contradict themselves on whether our Lord looked forward to an immediate fruition of the Kingdom of God upon the earth, or whether he expected his people to be overtaken with terrible calamities. The passage which, because of its presence in the Second Source, has most of all been cited to show that he foretold disasters is the Lament over Jerusalem. In Harnack's reconstruction it reads:

"Wherefore also the Wisdom of God said: I send to you prophets and wise men and scribes; some of them ye will slay and persecute; that there may come upon you all the blood shed upon the earth from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zacharias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. Verily I say unto you, All these things will come upon this generation.

"O Jerusalem! Jerusalem! which killest the prophets and stonest those that are sent to her! How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen her chickens under her wings, and ye would not. Behold your house is left unto you desolate."<sup>1</sup>

—Mt. 23.34–38 = Lk. 11.49–51; 13.34f.

The concluding words too should be added:

"And I say unto you, Ye shall not see me, until ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

—Lk. 13.35b; cf. Mt. 23.39.

#### I. ZECHARIAH BEN JEHOIADA

Those who believe the prophecy to be genuine hold that the Zacharias whom Jesus had in mind was the son of Je-

hoiada, mentioned in 2 Chronicles 24. 18 ff.<sup>2</sup> They argue that other prophets, such as Jeremiah and some of his precursors, had foretold woes to Jerusalem that actually came to pass. Moreover, a century before Jesus the Testament of Levi warned the Hasmonean high-priests:

"Therefore the temple, which the Lord shall choose, shall be laid waste through your uncleanness, and ye shall be captives throughout all nations."

—T. Levi 15.1.

About 30 A.D. the great reorganizer of Judaism after the Fall of Jerusalem, Johannan b. Zakkai, foretold destruction of the Temple on the basis of Zechariah 11.7 (B. Yoma 39b).

Jesus is said to have summed up the crimes to be atoned for by citing the first and the last martyrs mentioned in the Hebrew Bible. Martyrdom is the "theme song" of the closing chapters of Chronicles. The period it describes was memorable for many another execution, such as Jehoiakim's execution of the prophet Uriah (Jer. 26.20 ff), and the wholesale slaughters by Manasseh, of whom Josephus says,

<sup>2</sup> G. F. Moore, *Jour. Am. Oriental Soc.*, 1906, p. 317–323; John Chapman, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 13 (1911f), p. 398–410; cf. most commentaries, e.g. McNeile, p. 340 f; Allen, p. 250; Easton, p. 191; Plummer, p. 314; Strack and Billerbeck, I. 943; Zahn, *Kom. N.T.*, i (1922), 658f. According to Jerome, the Gospel of the Hebrews substituted "filium Joiadae," thereby affirming the designation.

<sup>1</sup> Harnack, *Sayings of Jesus*, §33 and §43 = p. 269f.

"He killed all the righteous men among the Hebrews, nor did he spare even the prophets, some of whom he slaughtered daily, so that Jerusalem ran with blood."

—Ant. 10.3.1 (38).

By way of summary the martyr theme is found in the closing chapter:

"And Jehovah, the God of their fathers, sent to them by his messengers . . . but they mocked the messengers of God and despised his words, and scoffed at his prophets, until the wrath of Jehovah arose against his people."

—2 Chr. 36.15–16.

The Zechariah passage is introduced with the words:

"Yet he sent prophets to them, to bring them again unto Jehovah; and they testified against them: but they would not give ear."

—24.19; cf. 25.15f; 28.9.

But one trouble with the notion that Jesus cited a character from Chronicles because Chronicles was the last book in the Hebrew Bible, is that *there was no last book in the Bible of his day*. The books of the Hagiographa were then copied on separate rolls, and so might be jumbled into most any order. As G. F. Moore aptly remarks, the typical explanation of the commentaries assumes that "the author of the Gospel had a Hebrew Bible made up like a Leipzig stereotyped edition"; actually in the lists of these writings Chronicles is sometimes mentioned first!<sup>3</sup>

An alternative theory advanced by Moore is that the Evangelist took the death of ben Jehoiada as "the typical example of the sacrilegious murder of a righteous man"; a choice motivated by the popularity of the story of his death in contemporary folk-lore. By stressing the symbolism, Moore seeks to

obviate the problem of the eight centuries which had intervened since his death.

But the incident becomes meaningless for the purpose to which Jesus is said to have employed it in view of the belief stressed in this same folk-lore that these crimes in the closing period of the Jewish kingdom had been fully expiated by the terrible chastisements at the hands of Nebuchadrezar. In particular, ben Jehoiada's martyrdom had been atoned for by a slaughter of "more than a million souls in all"; his blood, "seething and pulsating," awaited judgment two hundred and fifty-two years; thereafter it needed no more avenging.<sup>4</sup>

The martyrs whose deaths most of all required retribution were those who had perished from the days of the Maccabees. The legends cited by Moore belong to a later period when the two-fold threat of Gnosticism and Christianity forced studies into canonical channels. But prior to that threat the distinction between canon and apocrypha had been far less strict. Consequently, extra-canonical writings like 1 and 2 Maccabees and Enoch appear to have exercised more influence in the period prior to the fall of Jerusalem than did Chronicles.

The blood to be expiated included that of Onias III (2 Macc. 4.33–35; Enoch 90.8); the nameless women of 2 Macc. 6.10 f; the Hasids (Enoch 90.6–17; cf. 4 Ezra 8.27); the patriarch Eleazar (2 Macc. 6.18–31; 4 Macc. chs. 5–7); the Seven Brethren and their mother (2 Macc. ch. 7; 4 Macc. chs. 8–14). Vengeance awaited too for the victims of the Hasmonean priesthood (Bel. Jud.

<sup>3</sup> Moore, *op. cit.*, p. 319, n. 2; cf. Nestle, *ZNTW* 6.199 f.

<sup>4</sup> Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, iv. 304; cf. p. 259; vi. 396; Strack and Billerbeck, i, 940 ff; Moore, *op. cit.*, p. 320 ff.



i. 81-98; Ant. xiii. 372-383) and of Herod the Great (Bel. Jud. i. 437 = Ant. xv. 41 ff; Bel. Jud. i. 648 ff = Ant. xvii. 149 ff).

A decisive reason for refusing the notion of ben Jehoiada to Jesus is the vividness with which the figure of his beloved master and friend, John the Baptist, dominated his thinking and motivated his activity. So impelling to him was that event that we should have expected him to say, "from the blood of Abel unto that of John."

The expression "from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zecharias" does seem to imply a time factor. There can be no justification for fixing the terminal point of the prophecy at eight centuries prior to the final consummation of history. The words, "Ye will slay and persecute" when placed on the lips of Jesus seem to look forward to future events and the "ye" refers to persons who are yet to participate in those events. Antiquity often sought to meet the difficulty by selecting the father of the Baptist as the Zacharias whom Jesus had in mind.<sup>5</sup> Others suggested that Zacharias ben Baruch who was slain in the First Rebellion. A few, and they include our First Evangelist, sought to lessen the time gap by naming the minor prophet, ben Berechiah.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5</sup> *Protev. Jacobi* 23 f; Origen, *Comm. Matt.*, in loc. (Migne XIII. 1630); cf. Moore, *op. cit.*, 318 f, n. 3. These legends of the death of John's father seem to derive from a notion that similarity of names should in some mysterious manner result in a similarity in their deaths. See, further, Hugh J. Schonfield, *The Lost "Book of the Nativity of John,"* 1929.

<sup>6</sup> See discussion by B. W. Bacon, "The Plaint of Wisdom" in *Expositor* viii. 10 (1915), 493-511; cf. Bultmann, *Gesch. syn. Trad.* (1921), p. 68 f and in Hans Schmidt, ed., *Eucharisterion* (1923), Forsch. R.L.A.N.T., 2. 6-11.

A modern way of avoiding the difficulty is to assume that Jesus was quoting a lost work entitled "The Wisdom of God."<sup>7</sup> There can be no doubt about the Wisdom character of the quotation, as it has many analogies; what is uncertain is whether we have to do with a specific writing or with someone who becomes the mouthpiece of divine Wisdom. In any case, a Wisdom saying sounds strange upon the lips of Jesus, for it suggests a background of Jewish Hellenism. That it comes from Greek-speaking circles is reinforced by the use it has made of the Septuagint of the ben Jehoiada passage: note, in particular, αὐλὴ οἴκου κυρίου (2 Chr. 24.21 LXX), and μεταξύ . . . καὶ τοῦ οἴκου (Luke 11.51); and the double sending προφῆται καὶ ἄγγελοι (LXX), and προφῆται καὶ ἀποστολοι (Q).

Against Jesus' use too is a viewpoint that seems to reflect the siege of Jerusalem. Then it was that the full measure of iniquity was expiated in devastating judgments. This impression is gathered from Matthew's words, "Fill ye up the measure of your fathers" (v. 32). The restraining of vengeance, until such a time as sin had reached a predetermined total, accords with an established doctrine Judaism (e.g. Gen. 15.16; Dan. 8.23; 2 Macc. 6.14; 1 Thess. 2.15). Inclusiveness of the martyrdoms is indicated in the words, "all the blood shed upon the earth."

The national catastrophe that could expiate such a vast measure of sin ap-

<sup>7</sup> E.g. Matt. 23.35 and Chrysostom; cf. composite figure in a Syriac manuscript at Union Theological Seminary, New York, which says of the Minor Prophet, "It was he whom Joash, king of Judah, killed upon the steps of the altar."—*Journ. Bib. Lit.*, June 1887, p. 34.

pears to have been in an advanced stage at the time of this oracle.

A further hint on the date is the theme of God's abandonment of the doomed city, "Behold your house is left unto you desolate" (Mt. 23.38 = Lk. 13.35). The idea that a place without its protecting deity would be quickly overcome is common in antiquity. It is stated in the Old Testament with reference to Israel in Deut. 31.17; Isa. 2.5; Jer. 7.28; 12.7; 23.39, and more specifically to the Temple in Jer. 22.5. In Ezekiel 3.12 we can just see the gods rushing from the Temple and leaving the city to its doom. God's exodus in 2 Baruch 8.1f is associated with his act of abandoning Jerusalem to Titus:

"A voice was heard from the interior of the temple, after the wall had fallen, saying:  
'Enter, ye enemies,  
And come, ye adversaries;  
For he who kept the house has forsaken (it).'

According to Josephus:

"The priests on entering the inner court of the temple by night, as their custom was in the discharge of their ministrations, reported that they were conscious, first of a commotion and a din, and after that a voice as of a host, 'We are departing hence.'"

—Bel. Jud. vi. 299 f.

Similarly, Tacitus wrote,

"Of a sudden the doors of the shrine, opened and a super-human voice cried: 'The gods are departing': at the same moment the mighty stir of their going was heard."

—Hist. v. 13.8

In the mind of the author of our logion the Wisdom of God, who had brooded over the city like a hen over her chicks, is seen abandoning it because

\* On false oracles during the siege, see S. E. Johnson, in *A. T. R.* 21 (1939), p. 205 f. Cf. Virgil, *Aeneid* ii. 351 f; Macrobius, *Sat.* iii. 9.

of its refusal to heed her gentle entreaties. She will not return again till at the Parousia (Mt. 23.39 = Lk. 13.35). "Wings of the Shekinah" is a common expression in Jewish literature of God hovering over his people: cf. Ps. 17.8; 36.7; 57.1; 61.4; 63.7; 91.4; Deut. 32.11; Ruth 2.12.

## II. ZACHARIAS BEN BARUCH

There is but one Zacharias known to history whose martyrdom answers to certain of the requirements of this passage, namely the ben Baruch of the First Rebellion.<sup>9</sup> Josephus says of him:

"The Zealots . . . had determined to put to death Zacharias, son of Baris, one of the most eminent of the citizens. The man exasperated them by his pronounced hatred of wrong and love of liberty. . . . Two of the most daring of them then set upon Zacharias and slew him in the midst of the Temple."

—Bel. Jud. iv. 5.4 (334-343).

Coming just before the destruction of the city his death would become a natural terminus for crimes to be expiated. Indeed it was so regarded by many commentators as long as notions about detailed forecasts allowed ascription to Jesus.<sup>10</sup> Matthew may have initiated the belief, as his "Zacharias, son of Barachia" finds readiest explanation in

<sup>9</sup> The *Bápeis* favored by MSS of Josephus, is presumably a corruption of *Bapaxias*; there are several other variants also. See Niese, vol. vi, p. 391; Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii. 309.

<sup>10</sup> Calmet, writing about 1722, claimed "many learned commentators" had shared in this view, notably Grotius and Jansen. Others reported include: Hug, Osiander, Credner, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Gfrörer, Baur, and Keim; cf. Fritzsche, *Evang. Matt.* (1826), p. 690 f; Meyer, *Matt.* (1884), p. 398. Chief modern advocates are Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evang.*, 2d ed. (1911), p. 118-123; Dobschütz, *Eschatology of the Gospels* (1910), p. 90n.

confusion with "Zacharias, son of Baris," or Baruch, victim of the Zealots. So far as we know the minor prophet died a natural death.

Voltaire, professing to refute taunts of sceptics, finds here apt fuel for his exquisite satire:

"There is not (say they) in Hebrew history any Zachary slain in the temple before the coming of the Messiah, nor in His time, but in the history of the siege of Jerusalem, by Josephus. . . . Hence they suspect that the gospel according to St. Matthew was written after the taking of Jerusalem by Titus. But every doubt, every objection of this kind, vanishes when it is considered how great a difference there must be between books divinely inspired and the books of men."<sup>11</sup>

To a number of scholars the damaging implications mentioned by Voltaire have been decisive for rejecting the theory of ben Baruch, inasmuch as they cannot concede the implied late date for the Second Source.<sup>12</sup> However the drift of studies in the Synoptic Problem has seemed to show that much of Q was amorphous and the Gospels in which this logion occur to date not earlier than the reign of Domitian. Hence such secondary objections as are raised by Chapman and McNeile are the only ones that need concern us seriously.

1. We are told that a Christian writer could hardly have felt so deeply the death of ben Baruch unless this martyr had been a Christian, which obviously was not the case<sup>13</sup>. But the objectors forget that the Wisdom logion need not have been Christian. And, if it was, its natural place of origin was at Pella among Jacobean Christians who in their

conflicts with Paul had shown themselves more conscious of their union in the household of Israel than in that of Jesus. Hence the absence of known Christian martyrs in this general period, aside from James and John, is of small importance:<sup>14</sup> to the author of this logion every Pharisee rabbi who died protesting against the impiety of armed resistance, was as truly a martyr as if he had been a member of the Messianic synagogue. Of the companions of Johanna b. Zak-kai, many appear to have perished at this time; he himself escaped only by being smuggled out of Jerusalem in a coffin.

2. We are told that ben Baruch could not have qualified among the "prophets and wise men and scribes." It is indeed true that his "pronounced hatred of wrong and love of liberty" (Bel. Jud. iv. 335) might have been considered less a mark of being God's messenger than the warning of judgment by ben Jehoiada. But the same issue might be raised of Abel, and of many an unnamed witness for righteousness whose blood was to be avenged. Moreover, choice of ben Baruch has little to do with the comparative degree in which he qualified as member of one of these three categories of messengers: the focus is not on the man himself but on the terminus of time.

3. "Unless Zacharias was a priest on duty," what was he doing "between the temple and the altar?"<sup>15</sup> This objection of Chapman, reechoed by McNeile, is invalidated by the fact that the balance of probability points to ben Baruch having been a member of the priesthood. That conclusion follows from the description of him by Josephus

<sup>11</sup> Voltaire, *Works*, Du Mont ed. (1901), vol. vii, p. 107 f.

<sup>12</sup> E.g. John Chapman, *op. cit.*, and McNeile, *St. Matthew*, p. 339 ff.

<sup>13</sup> Chapman, *op. cit.*, p. 401.

<sup>14</sup> For contrary opinion, *ibid.*, p. 406.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 403 f.

as "one of the most eminent citizens" and that "he was also rich": qualities which applied to few aside from the priesthood. Moreover, the words "between the temple and the altar" have their origin less in historical fact than in an effort to embellish the enormity of the murder. Nor of the earlier Zacharias is it said he was killed "between the temple and the altar": the designation is, "in the court of the house of Jehovah," which is matched by the "ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ ἱεροῦ" for ben Baruch (Bel. Jud. iv. 343).

4. Again, we are told that the author of the logion could not have had in mind ben Baruch because the very class of persons who died with him at this time to the number of some twelve hundred are those against whom Jesus is made to speak so bitterly.<sup>16</sup> But the alternative choice of ben Jehoiada offers a similar anomaly: though he was a priest, his martyrdom was expiated by the slaughter of an immense number of priests. The Bible offers many examples of such a shift in the target. To the textual critic there is no more valued means for disentangling the sources.

5. Chapman experiences "grave difficulty" in supposing that Luke and Matthew ascribed to Jesus a prophecy they knew he had never spoken. But surely it is unfair to judge them by modern standards. They sincerely believed that their Lord was still speaking, and though out of sympathy with the Goëtist extremes of the Fourth Gospel, never hesitated to make him author of ideas they believed worthy for him to have spoken.

### III. A COMPOSITE ORACLE

But the case for ben Baruch would be invalidated if Jesus himself had

quoted an ancient oracle and if the two portions of the logion can be isolated as in Luke.

Actually, our Lord is indeed represented as quoting from an apocryphal writing, "The Wisdom of God." Spitta suggests that it was the midrash on Kings mentioned in 2 Chr. 24.27.<sup>17</sup> Because the martyrdom of Zacharias is the terminus of sins to be expiated the oracle must have been written prior to a new crop of martyrdoms and, if not as early as Spitta alleges, at least prior to Maccabean times. The words that follow in Mt. 23.36—Lu. 11.51b, "and I say unto you" would then be understood as the comment that Jesus is alleged to have made on this ancient oracle.

But there are several difficulties in assuming that our Lord himself is citing the passage. Such a formal quotation does not seem to suit him; it is especially hard to ascribe it to him as a part of the heated controversy with his opponents. Again, the ascribing to him of a Wisdom passage is suspicious, inasmuch as from the dawn of the Christian movement he himself was considered an incarnation of the Wisdom of God. There are certain similarities to Matthew 11.28-30, where too gracious Wisdom is pleading with her rebellious children whom she would gather under her protecting wings that they might find rest for their afflicted souls. Least of all is it easy to impute to Jesus the idea that God traps men into sin so as to punish them: that doctrine, which was familiar

<sup>17</sup> Fr. Spitta, *Die synoptische Grundschrift* . . . (1912), p. 334. The Wisdom source appears to have been first noticed by Hengel (Amst. 1824); its significance was developed by David Strauss. Harnack thinks Jesus himself is quoting it—*op. cit.*, p. 103; John Chapman suggests he is paraphrasing Prov. 1. 21-30—*op. cit.*, p. 409 f.

<sup>16</sup> Bel. Jud., iv. 333; McNeile, p. 340.

to the Deuteronomist (2 Sam. 24.1; cf. Ezek. 20.25 f), and probably survived to the time of the Chronicler, seems to be implicit in this logion.<sup>18</sup> Dissociating the words from Jesus disposes also of the problem of why he should go to the past for his symbolical martyr when his thoughts were on the Baptist whose death threatened to be the prototype of his own (Mk. 6.16 with Lu. 13.31).

Nor is it easy to separate the concluding half of the logion as Luke has done, but which must be jettisoned if anything is to be saved at all as genuine words of Jesus. Streeter's argument against the amputation<sup>19</sup> seems to be covered above. Against Streeter is the overwhelming consensus of scholarship which finds in this passage one of those rare instances where Matthew is right and Luke wrong.<sup>20</sup> Jerusalem here is presupposed in full view of the speaker; the words of the first part fit admirably with those of the second, and the phrase, "how often would I have gathered thy children," though hard to reconcile with

what is known of Jesus' mission is appropriate if Wisdom is still the speaker.

Thus we arrive at a contradiction, with the first and second halves composed centuries apart and yet the whole giving an appearance of unity.

The solution we propose is that the second part is a midrash on the first. Some church prophet, perhaps in the Jacobean community at Pella had seen in the death of Zacharias ben Baruch of 68 A.D. an antitype to that of ben Jehoiada of the ancient oracle. Since Jesus was believed to be himself the Wisdom of God, it was but natural to make him spokesman for the entire logion. Though there had been a temporary suspension of his gracious ministry, both in the flesh and as entreating Wisdom, at the Parousia he would be manifested once more. That sure promise was offered as consolation to hearts broken by the catastrophe, and the expiatory character of these events fitted them into God's divine purpose.

Thus the historical Jesus who wept over Jerusalem must be sought from the time of the First Rebellion, rather than in the person of our Lord. This later Jesus was a farmer. The son of a certain Ananus, he went about crying, "Woe, woe, to Jerusalem." Josephus pictures him as beginning his wail about 61 A.D. and continuing it "seven years and five months" until he was killed by a stone from a Roman catapult (Bel. Jud. vi. 300-309).

The logion takes its place with Luke 21.20-36, which likewise, as Vincent Taylor has so ably shown, was "a cry from the siege."<sup>21</sup> Thus no exception is to be made to the outlook of Jesus as one looking forward to the glorious triumph of the Kingdom of God within the living experience of his auditors.

<sup>21</sup> Vincent Taylor, in *Journ. Theol. Studies*, 26 (1925), p. 136-144.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. T. H. Robinson, *The Gospel of Matthew* (1939), p. 192 f.

<sup>19</sup> B. H. Streeter, in Sanday, ed., *Studies in the Synoptic Problem* (Oxf. 1911), p. 153, 162-4; cf. V. Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel* (1926), p. 155; P. Micklem, *St. Matthew* (Lond. 1917), p. 225.

<sup>20</sup> Wellhausen, *Das Ev. Lucas* (1904), p. 76; J. M. Creed, *St. Luke* (1930), p. 187; Plummer, *St. Luke* (1896), p. 351; B. S. Easton, *St. Luke* (1926), p. 224; B. Weiss, *Quellen des Lukasev.* (1907), p. 98; H. K. Luce, *Camb. Bible: St. Luke* (1936), p. 149; B. T. D. Smith, *Camb. Bible: St. Matthew* (1933), p. 137; H. U. W. Stanton, *St. Matthew* (1919), p. 583; McNeile, p. 340 f; Loisy, *Ev. Syn.* (1908), ii. 383. W. Manson, *The Gospel of Luke* (1930), p. 169 f; Montefiore, *Syn. Gospels* (1927), ii. 305. Cf. the verdict of Bacon, "On all the principal points" of reconstruction . . . "Harnack is right and Streeter hopelessly wrong." —"the Plaint of Wisdom," *Expositor* viii. 10 (1915), 494.



## BOOK REVIEWS

*Revelation and Reason.* By Emil Brunner.  
Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1946, pp.  
xii + 440. \$4.50.

*Revelation and Reason* by Emil Brunner is one of the most significant books in the field of theology to appear for many years. It was imperative that someone should make a thorough study of the epistemological problem of revelation in the light of recent theological trends with special relation to historical criticism. English readers now have such a basic study in Olive Wyon's translation of Dr. Brunner's *Offenbarung und Vernunft* published in Zurich in 1941.

In Part I Dr. Brunner develops his view that revelation is primarily encounter with the living God described in the witness of the Bible. "He Himself is the Revelation. Divine Revelation is not a book or a doctrine; the Revelation is God Himself in His self-manifestation within history. Revelation is something that happens, the living history of God in His dealings with the human race: the history of revelation is the history of salvation, and the history of salvation is the history of revelation" (p. 8).

Anglican readers will be interested to find that Dr. Brunner quotes with full approval William Temple's position in the symposium *Revelation* edited by Baillie and Martin: "Revelation is given in events, and supremely in the historical Person of Christ."

This dynamic interpretation of revelation stands in marked contrast on the one hand to the heteronomous supranaturalism of the scholastic view that reduces revelation to dogmatic propositions and on the other to the fundamentalist position that identifies revelation with the sentences of the Bible. "The Bible itself, when it speaks of revelation points beyond itself to an event to which indeed it bears witness, but which is not the Bible itself" (p. 12).

Both Catholic scholasticism and Protestant fundamentalism have corrupted the Biblical understanding of faith by making faith the acceptance of intellectualistic dogma. "This alteration in the understanding of faith, which turned the relation of trust in, and obedience to, the Lord of the Church into the authoritarian doctrinal belief in the Bible, is the ultimate reason for the perversion and weakness

in Christianity and the Church, from the second century down to the present day" (p. 39).

For Dr. Brunner the "knowledge," if such a word can properly be used, given by revelation differs in kind and not merely in degree from secular knowledge. Secular knowledge makes one the master of that which he knows, enlarges his store of cognitive detail, but does not transform the knower. It is a movement of self-isolation. In revelation, on the other hand, one is taken captive by the living Lord, receives a minimum of technical detail, but is transformed by the experience. He is freed from self-isolation by the Word of God that is a community-creating-word. In short, revelation in the Bible is not "something," but the actual self-manifestation of God.

This basic perspective of the truth as encounter sheds new light upon the perennial tension between faith and reason, the historical record of which seems to have produced greater facility in stereotypes than profundity of treatment. Liberals who have been all too prone to dismiss the complex movement of "neo-orthodoxy" as part of a general contemporary retreat from reason will do well to study Dr. Brunner. For him revelation does not destroy reason, but rather establishes it in its true position. It saves reason from the arrogance of claiming for itself an illusory autonomy. "Jesus Christ is not the enemy of reason, but only of the irrational arrogance of those who pride themselves on their intellect and on the irrational self-sufficiency of reason" (p. 16).

Such a view as this finds reflection in the author's treatment of revelation in nature and history. Here he is at pains to separate himself from Karl Barth's tendency to restrict revelation to the knife-edge appearance of Jesus Christ, a view which compels Dr. Barth to underestimate the significance of the revelation in the Old Testament as mere "tokens." He further differs from Dr. Barth in holding that man possesses a capacity to receive the revelation (the real content of the *Imago Dei* for Brunner) in that the revelation uses human speech and grammar, and passes through a process of understanding by man. Dr. Barth denies this in his insistence that even the points of contact are given in the event of revelation.

Dr. Brunner develops the Pauline concept of a revelation given in the creation, but corrupted by human sin. "Thus the doctrine of a general revelation is the basis of the assertion of the responsibility of man before God; it is at the same time the point of contact for the evangelistic call to repentance" (pp. 64 f.).

The chief witnesses to the revelation in Jesus Christ are the Scriptures, the Church, and the Holy Spirit. The special witness of the apostolic period which in a sense is both the product of the living voice of the Church and the very creator of that living Church becomes regulative and definitive for the post-apostolic Church. To say, without such serious qualification as to render questionable its very use, that the Church "is an extension of the Incarnation" is to indulge in a confusion of categories more conducive of error than of serious thought. "The Apostle stands on the border line where the history of revelation becomes the history of the Church; he has a share in both; he is the final point of the history of revelation as something unique; and he is the starting point of the history of the Church, as a new, continuous entity, based upon revelation" (p. 122).

Dr. Brunner emphasizes strongly the function of the Church as a "witness and keeper of Holy Writ." It is the saving fellowship and may everywhere be recognized by the test: *Ubi Christus, ibi ecclesia*.

Part II is an apologetic for revelation in just those problems where the issue is critical for our day: the relation to the world's religions and to the supposed essence of religion in the naturalistic interpretation, the significance of historical criticism, the relation of revelation to a rational theology based upon the speculative arguments for the existence of God, the concept of a Christian philosophy, and the problem of myth.

One of the most interesting sections is the one in which Dr. Brunner shows that the Christian claim to possess revelation differs in kind from that made by any of the world's living religions. One wishes that he had gone on to show the relation of the revelation given in nature and history to the religions of the world.

Liberals who express the fear that "neo-orthodoxy" is merely a disguised fundamentalism will do well to study the chapter on "Biblical Faith and Criticism." The importance of the full and frank acceptance of historical

criticism found here may help to bridge the chasm that seems to be widening between European theology and American theology. "The Church must learn to combine Biblical faith with Biblical criticism just as she has had to learn that in perceiving the Godhead of Christ she must not forget His true humanity, and in the Jesus who could be tired, hungry, troubled, and sad to perceive and to grasp the eternal Son of God" (p. 276).

Dr. Brunner believes with the Thomists, but on different grounds, in both the possibility and the necessity for a Christian philosophy. He stands against the theological exclusiveness of Barthianism and points clearly to the task for the Church in our chaotic period. "The events of our own day have at last shown us that all culture needs a Christian foundation. Were it true that the Bible could give us an answer to every question, then we might leave the business of this foundation to the theologians. Everyone knows that this would not do the world any good. We need Christian specialists in all spheres of life; hence we need a Christian philosophy, which, from the standpoint of the Christian faith, can penetrate into the region which the theologian does not enter, because he also is only a specialist in a particular sphere of knowledge, namely, in that of reflection upon the divine revelation. The co-ordination of the various spheres of life is the task, not of the theologian, but of the philosopher. But if this co-ordination is to take place from the standpoint of the Christian faith, then we need precisely a Christian philosophy" (p. 395).

WILLIAM JOHN WOLF

*Episcopal Theological School*

*Prophetic Religion.* By J. Philip Hyatt. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1947, pp. 188. \$1.75.

Professor Hyatt has given us a workmanlike treatment of the seven prophets, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Second Isaiah (cc. 35, 40-55) whom he regards as "normative for the type of religious thought generally termed 'prophetic.'" It is this same aspect of religious experience which he sees reflected in the personality and career of Jesus, and there is frequent reference, usually at the end of the various chapters, to the

person and work of Jesus in the light of the findings derived from a study of these same seven prophets. These analogies are not so extensive in the final chapters, those treating the nationalistic outlook of the prophets, their teachings about God, and their doctrine of sin and forgiveness.

In 165 pages of actual text a great deal of ground is covered and there is little room for the usual scholarly parade of authorities and arguments for the conclusions adopted on controversial issues. The author, very wisely, has preferred to allow the prophets to speak for themselves in numerous quotations. The reader is conscious, however, that the book has been written in the full knowledge of modern Biblical criticism. To the present reviewer, at least, the resultant statements represent in general a sound and acceptable scholarship although on certain points there will always be a variety of opinion. For the most part, the book covers familiar ground; but the reader will be interested in the fresh insights in connection with the calls of Isaiah, p. 34, Ezekiel, p. 37, Amos, p. 38, and with the experience of Elijah at Horeb, p. 157.

In his preface Professor Hyatt disclaims any extended discussion on the relevance of the prophets and their religion for our own day but there are, nevertheless, numerous implicit suggestions throughout the book. For example, in the summary of Chapter III, "The Called of God," he indicates three notes in the prophetic call which certainly should be present in the modern Christian Ministry, clerical or lay: imagination to see unusual significance in common things, proclamation of the word, perseverance under failure. So in Chapter VI, "The Prophetic View of History: The Future," the viewpoint of the prophet and of the apocalyptic writer are distinguished and Jesus is placed with the former, although the apocalyptic background and setting of his teachings are recognized. The author indicates the two elements present in the prophetic teachings, "judgment not only of wrath upon sin but of grace upon sorrow." Certainly these are urgently needed in modern preaching.

In Chapter VII, "The Prophets and Ritualism," the prophetic denunciation of ritualism is taken at its face value although the author indicates quite rightly that this was not Jesus' position. "To his mind the offering of gifts

on an altar in a temple was not in itself an offense to a holy God, but the worshipper must learn to put first things first." I believe that an increasing number of scholars are coming to see that we must say essentially the same about the prophets. Herein lies the major defect in an otherwise valuable little book, that it would consider the religion of the prophets and of Jesus apart from the other great Hebrew traditions and the priestly in particular. Professor Hyatt begins his book with this significant statement. "It [prophetic religion] seems generally to refer to that type of religion which emphasizes ethics and the ethical nature of God. A contrast is often expressed or implied with priestly religion and popular religion." It is a contrast with which such prophetic passages as Hos. 4 and Mal. 2 would not rest content. One cannot search successfully for "the key ideas of the religion on which Jesus built" if one does not turn to the Law as well as to the Prophets. It was a two-fold revelation which Jesus is reported to have said he came not to destroy but to fulfill. Certainly when Jesus wished to summarize God's demands upon man he did it with two passages from the Law; and as Professor Hyatt himself points out, the ideal of Matt. 5:48 receives its special significance from a passage in the Law, Deut. 18:9-14.

CORWIN C. ROACH

*Bexley Hall, Kenyon College*

*Heralds of God.* By James S. Stewart. New York: Scribners, 1946, pp. 222. \$2.50

Dr. Stewart is pastor of the North Morning-side Church in Edinburgh and was recently appointed to the chair of New Testament literature at New College. He is also one of the best preachers in Britain to-day. In this book he presents a series of five lectures originally given on the Warrack Foundation at St. Andrew's and Edinburgh to Divinity students and ministers on the more important phases of the preacher's art. In the very title of the volume, *Heralds of God*, he sets forth his fundamental conviction that all real preaching is simply the "proclamation of the mighty acts of God," a thesis to which he clings consistently. While he feels in preaching a man must always be himself and, further that there are intangible

factors of personality that make the difference between great and mediocre preaching, yet there is much that one preacher can share with another that will help to lift the general level.

The first lecture is an attempt to assess the temper of the age in which we live. A preacher to be effective must know the moods and spiritual climate of the generation and reinterpret the ageless gospel against the background of the contemporary situation. To Dr. Stewart the age can best be understood as presenting a series of tensions, of disillusionment (despair) and hope, of escapism and reality, of scepticism and faith. The chapter is full of good things and calls for a re-reading. The second lecture is concerned with the preacher's theme, which for Dr. Stewart means preaching Christ only and always, in His incarnation, His atoning death and His resurrection. The redeeming message that lies at the heart of these aspects of Jesus' experience must be preached as a proclamation of God projecting Himself into history. "In Christ God has acted in history decisively and for ever. In Christ God has bridged the gulf between the worlds." Such, he states, was the secret of success of the apostolic preaching which ushered in a new era of the spirit with power; and modern preaching will be crippled until it recaptures the same values.

Expository preaching, he believes, should be the norm, not topical. There are two reasons why this is so. One is that it keeps the preacher close to the Bible, which alone is the source of revealed truth; the other is that such sermons are almost certain to supply freshness, variety and profundity, especially when the preacher is guided by the use of the Christian year. The author's suggestions as to the structure of the sermon and methods of preparation have much practical value for the initiated as well as the beginner. All will likewise profit from his discussion of the use of illustrations, quotations, language, the choice of texts and delivery.

It is a book full of meat on every page, with ample illustration of all subject matter, and with a quality of thought and style that warms the heart with the inner fire that animates one who approaches his own preaching task with deep reverence and holy fear.

HENRY H. SHIRES

*Church Divinity School of the Pacific*

*The Interseminary Series.* Vol. III. *The Gospel, the Church, and the World*, edited by Kenneth Scott Latourette. Vol. IV. *Toward World-Wide Christianity*, edited by O. Frederick Nolde. New York: Harpers, 1946. \$1.50 each.

These two volumes are an effort to state in positive terms the possible contribution of Christianity in solving today's problems as they were so well analysed in the first two volumes (reviewed previously) of the Interseminary Series. As was pointed out in the former reviews, although this series of books was prepared specially for study and discussion by groups of theological students and their delegates to the Interseminary Conference (held in June, 1947) the usefulness of the series is for a considerably larger number of people than is envisioned in the original purpose.

Volume III, *The Gospel, the Church, and the World*, is addressed to the question: "Has the Church the spiritual and moral resources to meet the present world crisis?" The answer is set forth in three parts: the first deals with the nature of the Gospel and of the Church, the second is an inquiry into the means whereby the Gospel and the Church operate, and the third surveys the task which the Church faces today.

The high spots of Volume III are to be found in Chapter II, "The Revelation of God in Christ," by John Knox; Ch. V, "The Responsibility of the Church for Society," by Richard Niebuhr; and Ch. VI, "The Limitations of the Church," by John C. Bennett. The editor and his other colleagues have done their particular assignments well but with no great brilliance.

The reviewer finds irritating, in this particular volume, two features that are to be found more frequently than coincidence would justify. Firstly, is the hortatory note struck time and time again, although it is presented in disguised language; e.g. the opening paragraph of the editor's introduction, "Christians *must* seek to reappraise"; "They *must* be open-eyed"; "They *must* not seek to hide"; "They *must* not permit"; "One *must* not take counsel"; "They *must* also keep in mind"; etc. (italics are the reviewer's). Believe it or not, all of the above and more appear in one paragraph.



Secondly, readers will be irked by the stressing, or in some cases even the mentioning, of the obvious. Examples again drawn from the Introduction, without prejudice to the fact that some other portions of the book would supply as many illustrations, are as follows: "Stock-taking is important in the life of the Church." "The human race is facing the most crucial era in its long history. "We must not pre-judge the answers. We must not be content with facile and ready-made replies."

Volume IV, *Toward World-Wide Christianity*, is an anti-climax in the Series. The book is described as an invitation to study the means whereby the churches in our generation are seeking to fulfill their "accepted mission." In the words of the Introduction, "The title of this book . . . reaffirms a goal which roots in the tradition of the Gospel. It carries an admission that, after these many centuries of Christian activity, the goal has not yet been achieved. It recognizes our responsibility, under the guidance of God's Spirit, effectively to interpret the eternal truth of Jesus Christ to all men in the light of the needs and opportunities of our generation. It bespeaks a commitment to the demonstration of Christian fellowship in a world community."

The above may be a statement of the pre-suppositions of Dr. Nolde and his distinguished colleagues, but it seems to the reviewer most unlikely that such commitment, admission, recognition, and acceptance of mission are primary assumptions of the churches about which they so easily write. The reader has the impression that the realistic "bite" of the first volumes has become an insipid ethical idealism (there is one notable exception to the foregoing, i.e. the chapter by John C. Bennett). The "isness" of the previous approach has, beginning with the third volume and increasing in Volume IV, become an "oughtness."

Chapter 2 seems to be the heart of the book. Part I of ch. 2, by John A. Mackay, is an effort to set forth "The Biblical and Theological Bases for the Ecumenical Goal." There are three comments to be made about this section. Firstly, the author is to be commended for presenting the view, so ably developed by Charles Clayton Morrison in *What is Christianity?* and by others, that any discussion of the Church must be rooted in the ancient past of Israel and its covenant relation to God.

Secondly, the author of this section is much concerned to make a case for "unity" both in the Old Israel and the New Israel. He does this without seeming to realize that biblically speaking what was involved was "community," which is something quite different from an idealistic notion or abstraction such as "unity."

And lastly, following a large section of Western Christian thought, the author resorts to the concept of "the Extension of the Incarnation" in his discussion of the Body of Christ and apparently ignores, what seems to some of us the biblical view, the Church as the Spirit-informed Body of which Christ is the Head; that is, the Church is the expression of an inner life which is the Holy Spirit rather than an outward and continuing expression of Christ in the world, or, to quote Dr. Mackay, "we are justified in regarding the Christian church as the visible, corporate expression of the living Christ." And again, "The body is the figure which sets forth the reality of the Church as the corporate continuation in history of the incarnation of Jesus Christ, who continues in a very real sense in 'the Church which is his body.'"

The reviewer is fairly sure that Dr. Mackay is not consciously taking over into his own thinking an ecclesiological viewpoint which has characterized Latin Catholicism for centuries; a viewpoint which is being increasingly criticised as one more aspect of the tendency of Latin Catholicism toward the monophysite heresy. But the lack of clear expression in the above passage does lead to confusion and makes more difficult the establishment of a sound biblical and theological basis for church "unity."

The third point I should make about Dr. Mackay's treatment is the seeming inconsistency represented by the following two passages: "In the promotion of the ecumenical movement, should any attempt be made to make that particular conception of order which is associated with the catholic view of the church the ecclesiastical norm for all Christians, the ecumenical movement can easily be wrecked" (p. 56). (This assuredly slams the door in the face of a large portion of Christianity and raises the question as to what does the author mean by ecumenicity.) However on page 57 we read, "Let each Christian tradition and denomination become concerned to



know itself. . . . Let each one examine itself and its record in the light of God's self-closure of Himself, in the light of the Biblical concept of the Church of Christ, in the light of Christian history in general, and also in the light of the needs of the Church and the world at the present hour. Let it then, in deep penitence, seek grace to repudiate and slough off whatever in its heritage has been unworthy. Let it, on the other hand, bring into the ecumenical unity of the Church of Christ that which it has been or done which is clearly of divine origin and designed by God to constitute the special witness of that group to Christian faith or Christian living."

Part II of the second chapter, written by Dr. Bennett, is lucid, penetrating, and realistic. It deserves more than one reading.

In closing, there should be raised a question as to the use of the words *ecumenicity* and *ecumenical*. The impression is given that these mighty high-sounding words must stand for something quite impressive. But the reader may have only the foggiest notion of the reality to which the handsome labels correspond. The context of these words offers little help to the uninformed and to those unfamiliar with the esoteric language of "professionals."

Semantically speaking, I am afraid, the constant use of *ecumenical*, etc. is with an "evocative" rather than a "designative" meaning; or "intensional" rather than "extensional" if one prefers to follow the American school of semanticism.

A passing glimpse of what the meaning of *ecumenical* is in the minds of some of the writers of the fourth volume may be found in chapter 5, by Paul Douglass, *Ecumenicity in America*. In the first place the chapter title is dubious because although one might have a certain group of activities which would be an expression in this country of a larger number of religious activities and opinions world-wide in character, universal in meaning, etc., such phenomena would not be "ecumenicity" but an expression of it. Moreover, as the title stands, it is an *abstraction* thus having no meaning; if it meant anything it would be ridiculous.

Well, on reading the section it is clear that it deals with the relation of various Protestant denominations with one and another. Could it be that *ecumenical* as commonly used is

merely a fancy way of saying "interdenominational"? Some slight evidence that this question is not so fantastic as it sounds and that "ecumenical" and "interdenominational" are practically synonymous in the minds of many may be found on page 174 (Section 2: The American Ecumenical Movement and Current Issues—*sic!*) The following "Freudian slip" appears: "Since the earliest days of the nineteenth century interdenominational cooperation has been going on on no small scale." After discussing various types of such cooperation, the Society for the Promotion of Christian Union to carry out the "Schmucker plan" for confederated churches, the Evangelical Alliance, and the establishment of the Federal Council, the author goes on (p. 177), "The present status of the ecumenical movement in America is the result of the ecumenical movement throughout the world *reinforcing the long existing American urge*" (*italics mine*). Again on page 191 we read, "Five phenomena have now been described as significant elements of the American ecumenical movement [this combination of American and ecumenical seems to me to be a contradiction in terms], acquaintance with which is basic for an understanding. They are: (1) the system of councils of churches; (2) unions of numerous denominations; (3) the community church; (4) the trend toward a stronger federal union; (5) the approach via the issues of the ministries and intercommunion."

To confuse interdenominational relationships and activities with the ecumenical movement is incredibly naive—or an intolerable presumption of the American provincial mind. Perhaps we should ban the use of the word *ecumenical* (and its derivatives) for seven years. The above may seem to be a small, perhaps even trivial, point and not worthy of such extended discussion. However, as I understand it, the Interseminary Series was prepared for the purpose of clarifying the thinking of seminarians (and other interested people) and this volume particularly "illuminates the ecumenical goal," to quote the publishers' advertisement. Dr. Mackay in the second chapter sets forth well the ecumenical goal. It is a pity that all other contributors to the volume did not stay with him on that point. The failure to understand or at least have a commonly accepted "reality-meaning"

for the word has led to confusion and has in good part vitiated the usefulness of the book for those faculty members and administrative officers of theological schools who deeply desire to encourage their students in progressing toward an ecumenical viewpoint and commitment to the ecumenical goal.

ALDEN DREW KELLEY

*Seabury-Western Theological Seminary*

*The Christian Heritage in America.* By George Hedley. New York: Macmillan Co., 1947, pp. 177. \$2.00.

In these days of ecumenical enthusiasm we are grateful for a book which promotes the cause of essential Christian unity in a readable manner. Too frequently the plea for mutual religious appreciation is obscured by theological abstractions which are scholarly and pious, but which make religious harmony seem a dull enterprise indeed. Professor Hedley has contrived to avoid pedantry and yet to be historically sound throughout. His book should be very useful to the teaching pastor who wishes to inculcate a consciousness of Christian unity at the grass roots.

Most of the chapters of this volume were first delivered as sermons in the Chapel of Mills College, and they evidently served their primary purpose admirably. The author has sketched the distinctive characteristics and most significant beliefs of the major religious groups in America, beginning quite properly with Judaism. He truly says that "the story of American Christianity begins at the eastern end of the Mediterranean," and he quotes approvingly the dictum of Pope Pius XII: "Spiritually we are Semites." The discussion moves on, in chronological sequence, to the Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholic types of Christianity, both of which are reviewed appreciatively. Particular stress is laid on the Catholic principle in religion: "We are Catholic in the permanent framework of our thought and in much of its persisting content. We are Catholic in our vision of one humanwide, humane deep community of likeminded persons. We are Catholic in readiness to be integral parts of an organic society. We are Catholic, then, in so far as we accept our place within the Catholic universal fellowship of men." Professor Hedley frankly recognizes that his own understanding of the term "Catholic"

would not be acceptable to the Roman Church, and he asserts that most of us are unwilling to surrender our judgment at all crucial points to the dictum of the Church. Nevertheless, American Christianity is deeply indebted to the Catholic ideal and must continue to foster it as a constitutive and creative factor in religious living.

The discussion of American Protestantism considers in turn the Lutherans, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Congregationalists, Baptists, Quakers, Methodists, and the Disciples of Christ. The various chapters are introduced by brief yet highly illuminating outlines of historical origins, so that each group is seen in the light of the environmental factors which determined its emergence. The chapter headings, incidentally, underline special characteristics of the groups, as for the Lutherans, "I Can No Other," Presbyterians, "To Glorify God," Episcopalians, "The Whole State of Christ's Church," Baptists, "Believers Are the Subjects," and the like. This is a valuable device, if only to correct certain popular misconceptions about the peculiarities of our denominations. In some instances one may feel that Dr. Hedley has been almost too generous in his estimate of the denominational virtues, as when he imagines that "it is by discipline that the Presbyterian churches yet maintain their strength and perform their chosen mission." (The reviewer is a doubting Presbyterian on this point). But perhaps it is the Christian way to evaluate all politics according to the ideal rather than the often disappointing actuality.

Of particular interest are the sections dealing with Liberal Christians and the Revivalists. The author emphasises that "Liberalism as such is not conclusion, but methodology." It is this methodology which, he claims, has gained the ascendancy in all the major seminaries and "now is more than ever characteristic of major denominational leadership." That judgment must be accepted with important reservations. In any case, exponents of the liberal point of view in all denominations have most resolutely attempted to come to terms with modern culture, especially in matters of humanitarian concern, so that it is not accidental that "in our culture the Churches most influenced by critical scholarship are those most interested in social well-

being." The significant efforts of Roman Catholic social and charitable movements obviously do not conform to the generalization.

Revivalistic Fundamentalism, on the other hand, represents a retreat from or rejection of virtually all values in modern culture, as well as an almost complete indifference to social problems as such. Sociologically viewed, the phenomenon of revivalism in contemporary America must be understood "in the light of the persisting conflict between farm and city, between the educationally underprivileged and the educationally advantaged." The sects are achieving notable success in metropolitan areas (e.g. Los Angeles) because they know how to "meet the transplanted agrarian on his own level," a level to which our more stable ecclesiastical organizations appear unable or disinclined to descend. The fervor of the sects is praiseworthy and should somehow be emulated by the old-line churches. However, "the real choice of the future is not between historic Christianity and the aberrant sects, but rather between a living Christianity and an unrelieved secularism." Unfortunately, the aberrant sects don't realize that the wave of the future is against them, and thus they continue merrily to gain converts among the underprivileged who cannot comprehend the liberalism of the big-league churches and are too "tender-minded" to find satisfaction in secular radicalism.

In two concluding chapters Professor Hedley moves toward a definition of principles and procedures by which the essential unity of Christianity (or, rather, the Hebrew-Christian faith: by the close of the book religious Jews have been taken into the Christian fold, by definition at least) may be more adequately realized. He affirms that "basically, it is not union of structure but unity of spirit that we need." This unity must be derived from the central value of the Christian faith, which is "the Christ," and not the historic Jesus of Nazareth." At this point the author loses his grip on "historical Christianity." Apparently he believes that Jesus was a Christ, but not the Christ: "Not a series of episodes in first-century Palestine, but a continuity of experience throughout the centuries gave reality to the conviction that God indeed might be found in the life of man. . . . Christianity is the affirmation that God may be known to man

because God can be found in man. To this affirmation every Christian, Jewish and Catholic and Protestant and liberal, gives his hearty and cardinal assent." Such a proposition can be acceptable only to some varieties of liberal Christianity and, perhaps, to a few liberal Jews. It by no means does justice to the great tradition of Christian faith as preserved in the major Catholic and Protestant communions. The Church's one foundation is still *Jesus Christ* her Lord, not simply a Christ-principle of generalized and universal incarnation, which skirts dangerously near pantheism. The historical and descriptive portions of this stimulating book are more satisfying than its brief excursions into Christological definition.

ALBERT LELAND JAMISON

Princeton University

*The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience.* By Geoffrey F. Nuttall. Oxford: Basil Blackwell (New York: Macmillan), 1946, pp. xii + 192. \$3.25.

This book ought to bring delight to specialists in seventeenth century Church history. To Anglicans generally it ought to bring helpful enlightenment. We are, on the whole, familiar with English Church history down to Laud. We pick up the story again after 1662. The intervening "time of troubles" when Anglicanism went into exile, however, is to most of us a blur—somewhat as the Middle Ages from Augustine to Hus and Luther are to the average Protestant. How many of us could give an informed account of the work of Richard Baxter, Walter Craddock, Morgan Llwyd, or John Owen? Yet these are names held precious in the churches which trace back to Puritanism. The days of Cromwell are for them what the days of Elizabeth are for us—their great age of triumph and of the forging of tradition in the fierce heat of war.

Dr. Nuttall's volume traces, to be sure, only one strand in the turbulent history of the days of Cromwell and the Puritan "saints." This strand is the place occupied by the Holy Spirit in Puritan and Quaker theology. But the strand is important. The age was precisely the age of "the Spirit." In Quakerism this pneumatology even endangered dependance upon the Bible and the historical drama of salvation

(see page 159). In the more sober Puritan sects, emancipations were checked by the more traditional Protestant emphasis upon the "Word." Yet Puritan and Quaker shared the liberating effects of the new age. Institutionalism of every kind loosed its hold—including the sacraments. Such chapter titles in the book as "The Witness of the Spirit," "The Liberty of the Spirit," "The Government of the Spirit," indicate the enormous importance which the concept of "Spirit" gained when the centrifugal forces of revolution had freed the sects for a time from traditional controls. During this brief period in history, the Spirit "blew where it listed." It required Cromwellian iron to bound threatened chaos. Yet this does not disprove the claim of the sectaries that they were rediscovering a lost jewel of Christian truth. "Left Wing" in the days of Cromwell meant "Quakerism." Would that "left wing," in the possible revolutionary decades of the twentieth century, might mean nothing worse!

But just what was the doctrine of the Holy Spirit which the Puritans and Quakers rediscovered? The author gives only a vague answer. Nor do the multitudinous quotations which at times threaten to swamp his narrative help much. Since the whole movement was a revolt against institutional controls, Holy Spirit was not anchored in the Church. The Spirit was individualized. "Fellowship of the Holy Spirit" meant direct experience of God (p. 145). "Spiritual" religion was virtually synonymous with "personal" religion. "The doctrine of the Holy Spirit," so Dr. Nuttall summarizes, "is a doctrine of a personal God, revealed in a Person and present in personal relationship with persons. The mediaeval tendency, following Aristotle, to treat God as an *ens* rather than as a Person, inevitably resulted in neglect of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit; and the Puritan emphasis on the doctrine was, equally, in part on account of the rediscovery of God as a Person."

Now, one may grant to the Reformation, and to Puritanism, that they rediscovered a truth here. God must ever be "He" and not "It." The concept of personality, and of the divine-human covenant as one properly understood only under personal categories, was largely lost in scholasticism. But can this recovery of Biblical personalism really be equated with

the New Testament doctrine of the Holy Spirit? Where is the story of Pentecost and of the Church? Where are the Pauline equations between "one body, and one Spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism"? When Quakers, for example, equate Holy Spirit with "God within" by citing John 1:9 ("which lighteth every man that cometh into the world"), what will they make of John 1:12, or of John 7:39 ("for the Holy Ghost was not yet; because that Jesus was not yet glorified")?

Dr. Nuttall himself (page 175) raises some of these questions. It is curious, however, that the connection between Church and Spirit scarcely once is so much as mentioned in the Puritan citations of Dr. Nuttall's volume. Only the Quakers, by way of a strange paradox, seem to have found a corporate check upon individualistic spiritual experience. Warm group-consciousness is a mark of sectarianism, but it is rarely explicit in any doctrinal discussion of Holy Spirit. With the Quakers the wheel does come full circle. They were accused, in the Puritan era, of merging Holy Spirit with the merely human. They were also accused, by reason of their emphasis upon corporateness, of resembling Rome. "What difference," so a contemporary comments (page 46), "is there in these things between George Fox and the Papists?"

Dr. Nuttall's book is, therefore, an historical monograph of real value. Twentieth century theology is beginning to wrestle earnestly with the Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Seventeenth century Puritanism, as the "age of the Spirit," can bring experiential testimony to bear upon this deep theological problem. It is clear from Dr. Nuttall's account, however, that this testimony is one of great confusions as well as of a modicum of light.

THEODORE O. WEDEL

*College of Preachers*

*Munera Studiosa*. Ed. by M. H. Shepherd and S. E. Johnson. With a Preface by H. B. Washburn. Cambridge, Mass.: The Episcopal Theological School, 1946, pp. ix + 182. \$2.00.

These studies were presented to Dr. W. H. P. Hatch by his friends on the occasion of his seventieth birthday. The writers, perhaps wisely, avoided the subject on which Dr.



Hatch is a noted expert, the Text of the New Testament. One exception is H. R. Willoughby's essay on "Archaic Crucifixion Iconography," a study of codex 2427, or Chicago MS. 972. This text of Mark is very close to B, with some notable omissions, as 7:3-4. One of the seventeen illustrations is a full page painting of the Crucifixion which is, however, more Johannine than Marcan. The date of this remarkable codex is the thirteenth or fourteenth century. The reason for the perennial popularity of the Psalms as vehicles of praise and treasuries of trust is set forth in C. L. Taylor's essay. "A Twice Buried Apocalypse" is the intriguing title of C. C. Torrey's article. The corpse, according to him, now rests in Second Esdras of the English Apocrypha, but was first buried in the Apocalypse of Baruch. Dr. Torrey justly reminds us what a stimulus for Apocalyptic could be found in the events of 69 A.D.: Nero vanished and appearing in a pretender, three rival Roman Emperors, battles in Rome itself, and the Capitol burned. H. J. Cadbury writes on "Superfluous 'kai' in the Lord's Prayer." Is not the fact simply that the Greek language attempts to express everything with a word, and some Greek words English can often only translate by underlining or similar devices; as in Euripides, Hippolytus 1171, *Pōs kai diōlet*, *eipe*, which means, "Say, how did he die?" This 'kai' is not translatable, but it is not quite superfluous. In "The Sources of Pauline Mysticism," C. C. McCown provides a phrase, "stimulus diffusion," to explain the so-called mysticism of St. Paul. Stimulus diffusion is the process whereby a new content, related but different, is put into another system. Thus a new content, the faith of the Old Testament, was expressed in the framework of the Mystery Religions, and this transformation helped Christianity to survive. Paul was canonized but Paulinism was forgotten, yet fortunately not entirely—is B. S. Easton's theme in "Post-Pauline Paulinism"; this is a neat epigram even though no 'ism' could include St. Paul. "The Source-analysis of Acts" is M. H. Shepherd's subject, one that leaves a wide room for speculation. If the first and second journeys of St. Paul are two accounts of the same tour, as Dr. Shepherd is inclined to believe, then there is only one missionary jour-

ney; for the second and third are the same, interrupted by a brief and probably unpleasant visit to his Eastern 'friends.' Incidentally, this theory would deprive canonical examiners of one of their favorite questions! The *Didache*, that *enfant terrible* of the first (or is it the second?) century is discussed by S. E. Johnson, who makes out a very good case for the pamphlet as a midrash on Matthew's Gospel, whatever else it may be besides. "Notes on Book Burning" is the unusual and hopeful title of H. S. Pease's article, in which he shows that it was probably often thought of as one way of damaging the health of the author of the offending book, either in this world or in some other, like sticking pins in a wax dummy. F. C. Grant concludes the volume with an essay on "Religion and Poetry," one which contains some destructive and well-deserved criticism of many modern, 'subjective' hymns in which the believer's feelings are the theme—with the natural and sickly result.

A. H. FORSTER

Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

*The Vita Sancti Fructuosi. Text with a Translation, Introduction, and Commentary.* By Frances Clare Noek. The Catholic University of America Studies in Mediaeval History, New Series, Vol. VII. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1946, pp. 163.

This dissertation is another contribution in this new series of medieval studies which is affording indispensable tools for a much-needed work in English; namely, an overall presentation of the history of the Church in Spain during the Visigothic period. The author, dissatisfied with the text of St. Fructuosus' *Vita* published in 1942 by R. F. Pousa, *San Valerio: Obras*, has given a revised text with translation and commentary based upon all known manuscripts and editions. She has worked, however, chiefly from the variants given by Pousa, because "in spite of repeated efforts it has been impossible to secure photostats of extant manuscripts from Spain." In her introduction a detailed review is made of the inadequacies of Pousa's text.

The author rejects the commonly accepted view of modern critics that the *Vita* was written by Valerius, though she maintains that it is



the work of a contemporary of the saint, and suggests "the possibility of a double authorship." The one secure date in the life of this eminent monastic founder and bishop of the Visigothic Church is Dec. 1, 656, when Fructuosus was made metropolitan of Braga. Something of the energy of the man's life is revealed in his supervision of the construction of his last monastery at night "by the aid of torches, so that it might be completed before his death." In reading his life I could not but be reminded of its similarity to that of many Celtic monks: its wandering character, his love and sympathy for animals, his insistence on living as a barefoot monk even after he became a metropolitan bishop, his love of the sea and desire to establish monasteries on islands off the shore. I am not convinced by the author's arguments that the convent for nuns founded near his house *Nono* did not make this establishment a double monastery. Fructuosus' *Regula* has such foundations in view. Moreover it is questionable whether the term *praepositus*, used to describe the monk who had charge of the nuns, means simply a sort of "guest master." With this minor reservation I should say that this dissertation is a model of such studies.

MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, JR.

*Episcopal Theological School*

*The Vitas Sanctorum Patrum Emeretensium.*

Ed. by Joseph N. Garvin, C.S.C. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, pp. vii + 567.

*The Vitas Sanctorum Patrum Emeretensium* is an anonymous seventh century document of Visigothic Spain consisting of five *opuscula*. The first three of these deal with miraculous events and visions put together by the author to prove the truth of the miracles of St. Gregory the Great's *Dialogues* and are very similar to that work. The first *opusculum* relates events contemporary with the author while the rest are presumably based upon oral tradition. The last two treat of the lives of five bishops of Mérida from the mid-sixth century to about 630. The life of the saintly Masona deservedly receives the most detailed treatment. The account of his struggles with the Arian

king Leovigild and the Arian bishop Sunna makes interesting reading.

As literature the *Vitas* are so unimportant that the great histories of Mediaeval Latin literature pass over them in silence. Historically they are valuable as sources for the period of Leovigild and Recared, but they must be used with caution. Their latinity is barbarous. Fr. Garvin meticulously lists its variations from the norm in vocabulary and syntax for some 90 pages of his introduction. Inevitably in a Catholic University dissertation the *clausulae* are duly analyzed.

The text itself and the translation occupy only 125 of the 567 pages. The translation is a real service as it facilitates reference for scholars and makes available for the general reader an example of a genre to which he could not otherwise have access.

Unfortunately the text is not a critical one. Fr. Garvin calls it "improved though somewhat eclectic." The MSS descriptions are not full and no attempt is made to classify them. The two oldest (one known to the editor only through De Smedt's earlier edition which in turn was based upon a copy made for the latter by a friend) are followed wherever possible. This is a shaky basis for a text and rather limits the usefulness of the voluminous commentary based upon it. For example, the editor's contention (pp. 23 f, 43) that the barbarous nominative plural *Vitas* was in the original title is not conclusively proved. We do not know the real value of the MSS in which it appears, are not certain in all cases that this is their actual reading, and if it is, cannot tell whether it is original or by a later hand.

The next 367 pages are taken up with commentary upon textual questions, peculiarities of vocabulary and style, and matters of historical and hagiographical interest. Full indices give easy access to this material. There is also a list of the author's borrowings from earlier writers and a useful bibliography. Immense labor must have gone into this compilation. The *Vitas* themselves hardly seem worthy of so much effort.

ROBERT B. PEGRAM

*General Theological Seminary*

## NOTES ON NEW BOOKS

*Pathways Through the Bible.* By Mortimer J. Cohen. Illustrations by Arthur Szyk. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1946, pp. xxv + 548. \$3.00.

In his introduction, Dr. Cohen states that this book

"seeks to hew out pathways through the richly luxuriant and forestlike complexities of the Bible literature, so that the unskilled traveller may find his way through it with ease and with pleasure. Having a kind of road-map, he is prepared to discover for himself the religious truths, the spiritual insights, and the inspiring literary beauties that lurk on every page and in every line and word of Israel's masterpiece" (p. xi).

The author accomplishes his purpose by presenting selections from the books of the Old Testament as thought units, each with a title and an introductory sentence. There is also a brief introduction to each book, twenty-six illustrations, and eight maps. The text follows the accepted translation, with occasional simplifications and rearrangement of verses.

The volume is beautifully done. It would be difficult to quarrel with Dr. Cohen's choice of passages, and his editorial work is a source of delight. He is the master of a simple, lucid style that put his devout scholarship and literary discernment at the service of young and untrained readers no less than those who know something of biblical study. And the illustrations are rich and vital, with intriguing detail in both picture and border.

This is the finest and most beautiful simplified version of the Old Testament I have seen.

H. G.

*A Plain Man's Life of Christ.* By A. D. Martin. New York: Macmillan, 1947, pp. xii + 217. \$2.00.

A. D. Martin died in 1940, and his last book was brought out this year with a prefatory note by Sydney Cave. As a life of Christ it falls somewhere between scholarly works like that of Goguel and the popular, half-fictional ones. It is a popular work, supplementing the information given in the Synoptics to bring the figure of Jesus to life; but that the author could

have done the other kind is clear from the footnotes.

One must say he has done the job he set himself about as well as it can be done. Jesus does come to life, and move before the eyes of the reader as a particular, flesh-and-blood man. There is enough detail (the story is based on Mark, with additions from Matthew and Luke) to accomplish the author's purpose, and very little that could be called superfluous. The gifts of imagination are here, but always under the control of scholarship and long reflection.

The great merit of a study like this is to bring to one's attention a great many things in the Gospels that one might overlook. On the other hand, the Gospels constantly betray this author, as they do all authors who try to use them as sources for what they are not, a biography of Jesus. This is especially clear and distressing in connection with scenes like the confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi. A scene which as it comes to us from the Evangelists has a clear import for faith and the theological self-understanding of the Church, becomes when reconstructed into a historical event a rather hopeless psychological puzzle.

There are, surprisingly, a few historical errors; and occasionally the author's desire to use all the details he can leads him astray ("Raise the stone and there shalt thou find me, Cleave the wood and there am I" is supposed to carry a reminiscence of labor in quarries and forests!) Also, there are the usual (in this kind of a work) vague comparatives and superlatives. On the whole, however, the treatment is thoughtful and restrained, and does illumine much in the Gospels.

H. G.

*An Album of Dated Syriac Manuscripts.* By William Henry Paine Hatch. Boston: American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1946, pp. ix + 286.

The importance of dated manuscripts for the study of palaeography is obvious—they are, indeed, indispensable, if palaeography is to be a science. From the examination of such manuscripts, esp. of their style of handwriting,

inferences may be drawn which apply to undated mss. This is the method by which, to the amazement of the layman, the experts are able to date within twenty-five years the papyrus fragments of the New Testament, e.g. the Chester Beatty or the Rylands fragment of John. The method applies to mss. in all languages—at least to all that have been done by professional copyists. The sumptuous *Album* which Dr. Hatch has produced is a monumental work of scholarship, and lays the foundation for accurate palaeographical study of Syriac mss. He has already placed scholars under deep obligation by his other works in the field of palaeography—New Testament scholars especially by his earlier volume, *The Principal Uncial Manuscripts of the New Testament* (Chicago, 1939). And not only scholars will be helped by the *Album*, but also beginners in the study of textual criticism or palaeography; for there is a magnificent introduction, dealing with the materials, styles, punctuation, dating, and other matters relating to Syriac mss., and applying also in great measure to the copying of mss. in other languages, esp. Greek and Latin. All students of the textual criticism of the Bible should read

this introduction, and bear its data in mind as they pursue their studies.

There are 200 plates, each with descriptive letterpress and notes. The mss. represented range from the fifth century to the sixteenth—more than half of them antedating the year 1000 of our era. (Dr. Hatch modestly apologizes for the absence of the only other dated ms. of which he is aware, a ms. of the Gospels dated 945: it is—or was—in Wolfenbüttel, and is inaccessible at present!) To make the volume twelve indexes: the mss. arranged according to location, biblical books and lectionaries, authors, scribes, and so on.

The work will be not only an authoritative guide to palaeographers of Syriac literature (most of which is of course ecclesiastical or biblical), but we can readily imagine that it will be an inspiration to an occasional university or seminary student to begin the fascinating and rewarding study which it so attractively opens up. The book is a credit not only to the author but also to the Academy which published it, and to the generous friends of learning, chiefly Professor Jewett of Harvard, who made its publication financially possible.

F. C. G.

mind  
ptive  
nted  
enth  
year  
pole-  
lated  
spels  
and  
vol-  
cord-  
aries,  
  
ative  
ature  
al or  
at it  
uni-  
the  
it so  
credit  
demy  
iends  
Har-  
cially  
  
a.